

THE SLUMS AND THE SOUL

"Lord, even our daily bread that You taught us to pray for
Has been taken from me; my needs grow every hour:

Even as a curse and a penance, Lord, You gave men work,
And now the penance itself is taken from me . . .

And Hope is changing to wrath amongst Your sons;
Prevent that, Lord; and make us to be prudent.

But with Your sacred corn and spices, Lord, men feed their
engine-fires

That they may grow rich from scarcity of food.

Is it right, Lord? shall it continue thus? Each day
I see injustice flourishing; I see, and cannot understand.

They pour life-giving milk into the rivers. I am young and
strong,

But I grow daily weak. . ."—(*From the German.*)

THE point of this article is not to emphasize "obscure miseries," because the high-heartedness of the people concerned is perhaps their most notable quality. I would like to comment briefly on two books, and a situation; and then to suggest that certain *needs* are so urgent and primary that Catholic faith and charity ought to concentrate on them, even though much that is more interesting or picturesque may have to be sacrificed.

"London below Bridges," by Mr. H. Secretan,¹ is "about that part of the South London riverside . . . immediately below the point where London Bridge marks the limit of sea-going shipping." It does not "wrestle with problems," but describes life in those parts, boy-life especially, and does so in those common-sense colours, so to call them, which are true to life. It is not a book of horrors, nor even of miseries. Indeed, it might be easier to paint horrible pictures of the Black Country, as Dr. Brett Young does so well.² Still, the greasy or dusty squalor of South London is worse than horrors. On those marshlands (for such they are, and often below river-level) live half a million people, between the Bridge and Greenwich. The district still labours under its nineteenth

¹ Bles, 1931 3s. 6d.

² "My Brother Jonathan," etc.

century tradition, when it became a mere unorganized mass of labour with nothing but the river and its jobs to hold it together. Housing is being "improved," but often you still penetrate through an almost invisible arch into a "court" into which light now comes because one of the houses, "being old and somewhat tired, sat suddenly down one morning." "Twelve little square boxes," in which live sixty people! Twelve feet from the windows, an immense factory-wall blocks out the air. From the street, already below river-level, you go down steps into the living-room. No running water in the house; no gas. The cleanest and most hard-working of women will never rid those old walls of their swarming inhabitants. . . . But at least this Court has its little *yard* to each house. "*Our yard*"! The enormous tenement-houses, built that a speculator "might extract from a mere quarter of an acre the rent roll of 150 families," have no such thing. Up storey after storey, perambulators have to be hoisted; the aged or sickly must climb. It is doubtful whether those families prize the sky at the top, common to all, more than "our yard," so deep down, is valued. And those sick! Cases of rheumatic fever must exist in damp, fireless rooms, because the only place for a bed is across the fireplace. In order that a man, dying of an incurable disease, may share a room with his wife (cook, day-nurse, night-nurse, house-tender and mother, all in one), *all* the rest must be packed into one room, sleeping, maybe, on chairs. Over-crowding, they say, is being "coped" with. True; but meanwhile, it takes five years to clear one bug-infested, rat-haunted, set of fetid courts, and where are the 1,600 inhabitants to go? Dagenham? Becontree? but those are ten or almost twenty miles away: how pay the extra three to six shillings a week in fares? and how seize the chance job, casual, known of only by sudden whispered words, dependent on the river and its incidents, which you *must* be on the spot to know of—let alone take? And if you are told you must have four rooms, not two, and can hardly pay your 8s. as it is, how shall you pay the 20s. now demanded?

Needless to speak of schooling, save to recall that parents, proud as they may be of their "clever boy," almost *have* to set him to work the moment they can: to win a scholarship is almost to penalize a whole family—during those extra five years he *might* have been helping the home.

As for work, Mr. Secretan points out how different is the

riverside, with its vague sort of work, from, say, a large northern town which has grown up under the shade of one main industry. There is no suggestion that a boy should prefer, and choose, a "line." And even here, some temperaments revolt from certain jobs—"chopping putrid buffalo meat for dog food" is not worth the extra shilling or two, though I have known boys grasp at the chance of cleaning out ships' bilges, though they were sick nearly all the time, or at "scaling," which is almost as bad, so suffocating are boilers. To have no work makes a boy feel that "the world has let him down and the sense of undeserved failure breeds cynicism." This is a "canker at the heart of boyhood." I am convinced that the boy who once showed me half a dozen padlocks, on his return from a fortnight's disappearance, had merely been struggling to express a strength he knew he possessed, but had no outlet for: the padlock suggested that he shouldn't or couldn't, get in. "*Shan't I!*" And he did; he conquered the padlock, but stole nothing. And I agree that next to the demoralization directly due to worklessness, the next worst thing is "the sense of insecurity" when you have a job. "As each generation grows to manhood, an increasing number are learning early in life that no effort of theirs can deliver them from the play of blind forces which may any day rob them and their family of their livelihood."

It is impossible to quote more from this book—which proceeds with a study of a boy's friends and evening hours; of clubs and their management: of a boy's "faith," and of his change into man's estate, and of his hour of "getting into trouble." I hope every school-library will contain it. No word, I guarantee, will injure either faith or morals! I want to underline one or two conclusions only. Boys in such parishes *must* have clubs. They cannot stay at home; we dare not force them into Communist or even secular clubs; we must be ashamed when the remaining alternative is a Protestant club. I have never known, I think, a boy's faith deliberately tampered with: but I need not stress the difference to a Catholic boy between such a club and "his own." They'd *like* to have their own. A boy's expression is between sullenness and shame-facedness, if when one asks him if he goes to the Catholic club, he has to answer: "*We ain't got none.*" Birmingham is the only city I know where Catholics seem resolved that no parish shall lack its club; and, that *lay-leaders* must be formed for them. Priests cannot, and

should not, attempt the whole thing unaided. A club is *not* a prolongation of school, let alone of church. It is a bit of a Catholic's general life—of Catholic life; and to ensure its being so, continual references to religion, ubiquitous pious prints are not needed—nay, repel. But what reliability, then, is needed in the lay-leaders! And what tact! Experience itself is insufficient without "formation." Hence the absolute rightness of the enterprise in Birmingham.

In such clubs, you have to look out for two things. First, the mysterious irregularities of mood due partly to adolescence. Boys suddenly become "fed up," you know not why, and they do not know why. In such hours you must rely on sympathy and confidence already established (and how long that will have taken!), and then, have the courage to wait and hold your tongue. Hardest lesson of all—to wait, wait and still wait. And to say nothing. And to be trusted all the time. Second, we have not to underrate intelligence. I genuinely believe that the level of intelligence will be lower in a "middle-class" club than in a "poor" club. In spite of themselves, boys are picking up phrases corresponding to ideas—making, if you like, ideas *viable*—that they never used to have. The cinema and the B.B.C. have almost more to do with this than straight schooling. A young man (22), who had never had any but the roughest work—he had returned from a stoker's job on a small tramp,—was talking to me on the roof of a Poplar club one evening. He was despondent. "I'm growing worse," he said. I answered that I didn't think so. "I am," he insisted. "I don't do wrong things like I did, but I'm hardening. I *cannot* become anything in my life, so why try?" Then he spoke about a quarrel, and what the other man had said that provoked it. "He ought to have *known*," said he, "what my reaction to such a thing would be!" Reaction! What one must fear is, *hiddenly hibernating ideas*. Usually they couldn't state them: hardly ever would they. They would fear to hurt a priest who was their friend, or be "given hell" by one who wasn't. But almost any lecture, any debate, will bring ideas to the surface. And half of them are connected with problems like Free Will. Half, with the impossibility of really acting according to what we're told we *should* do. "Can I ask you a thing? Sure you won't mind? . . . Well, why do the priests . . .? D'you think it's *right*?" Meanwhile, ideas are being pumped into their heads, and their imaginations are being inflamed, by

atheist-Russian prints, cinemas, concerts, sports-clubs that are so much more interesting than anything that "church" or the bulk of Catholic institutions supply! "Why *should* I come to the club? I can get a game o' billiards anywhere. And at the 'Red Flag,' ah! there you learn a thing or two!" We *dare* not cater just for piety and recreation.

I have no room to write about my second book, though I promised the boy who wrote it that I would. A page or two, from the other end—the priest's.

I do not want to define the district about which I want now to speak, more accurately than by saying that it is in the middle of the Dagenham-Becontree London County Council estate mentioned above. My reason for not naming priest and place accurately is, that I do not want this article to be an appeal, but the presentation of a problem. (There will *be* an appeal, independently. Of course, if anyone does not see it, and *does* see this article . . . there is nothing against my acting as temporary-pro-vice-treasurer for any small sum. . .) Besides this, I happen to know personally the district next door to Father X's, and it is hardly less desperate. And, in fine, I have a rather special affection for another parish in that Brentwood diocese, and on the whole ought to try to concentrate on the needs of that—they are different, but very urgent.

Essex, quaint and historical name, may remind us of fields, ancient villages, and Thames swinging lonely to and fro between London and the sea. As a matter of fact, the whole county (because of the creation of large works, for example—there is a concentration of them round Chelmsford,—is quite changed: but no part is so devastated as all the country along and north of the Thames estuary, which the Port of London has not long ago taken over in its entirety. The land is, of course, flat, and now looks as if it had been blasted by war. This is where the L.C.C. has erected whole towns overnight, in the hopes of relieving the congested slum-area of London. I am not crabbing the work of the L.C.C. At first, certainly, many of the cottages were vilely built—already every door, every window-sash is warping; the cement is splitting or flaking off; damp stains everything; the affrighted inhabitants, abruptly rooted up, did their best to restore slum-conditions so soon as possible. After all, the unusual is, as a rule, uncomfortable. Things may be better now—indeed, often the lay-out of that estate is impressive. Very wide roads; white

kerbs; grass strips by the streets with little timid new trees, destined to give real shade and to purify the air; cottages not ungraceful to look at. All the same, the approach is squalid beyond words; and the horizons are dismal beyond dreams. Splutters of derricks, glimpses of funnels, suggest the thrill of the sea; but this is not a sea-faring population. Great shadowy masses of works seem to have turned into semi-ruins before they can properly have been created. Rusty boilers; nondescript wheels; masses of tangled wire ropes; long, long dumps as if it were a mining centre, white and grey, discoloured by chemicals; abrupt official buildings such as schools, the rawest red-brick pretentiousness, standing in their sea of asphalt, inside railings; and then the interminable streets with a few flamboyant cinemas; shops, half of them flimsy and destined to change hands frequently after failure;—despite the L.C.C.'s honourable efforts, I was reminded of South African native locations on the fringe of towns, where the houses were made of petrol-tins and dung and the roads were hacked into deep ditches by the rain.

Possibly the whole district will not deteriorate, as parts have already done; possibly it may grow better. But given the flatness, the low-lying nature of the place, hardly above Thames-level, the character of the works around, it seems hardly likely to do so, and I cannot imagine it becoming beautiful. Even the stunted trees are wind-twisted. But I am concerned with the present. The L.C.C. has built in the district 25,000 cottages: the population for which Father X is responsible is 22,000, for the Catholic priest alone has a spiritual mandate in regard of souls, and the true priest will feel himself beholden to every man, woman or child in his district, of whatever faith they be or none. His Catholics are 2,000. But at least 25 per cent of this population is unemployed. Workers have to travel, as a rule, into London for their work; this means six or seven shillings weekly; and when your average wage is 55s., mounting, in favoured cases, to 60s., and when rates and rent are quite 17s., even to live in the fresh air hardly compensates for that heavy weekly fare. Of course, whenever possible, the wife has to do any work she is lucky enough to get; so the only choices are, to hand over your children (the average, I hear, is three or four!) to the care of others; which destroys the home; or to have none, which prevents a home coming into being.

Such an existence must inevitably, it seems to me, stifle

out all consciousness of spiritual things, save by repeated miracles of grace; and the habitual use of the ordinary means of grace at least demands that they should be accessible. Hitherto, they have hardly been so. Now that a priest has come to reside there, he has, of course, no presbytery; but the Faithful at least know where his cottage is and can seek him there when necessary. In one room of it he says his week-day Mass; on Sundays he hires a room in a hospital from 7 a.m. to noon. Quite two-thirds of the adult Catholic population have, altogether, lost the habit of going to Mass owing to mixed marriages, lack of schools or any Catholic organization for some time, at least, within reach; and, I expect, because of the despondency that always besets men for whom nothing goes right, and who soon enough feel that no effort is worth making. However, to this hospital room come, maybe, 200 to the 8 o'clock Mass, with an average of 70 Communions; 400 to the 10 o'clock Mass, with an average of a dozen Communions. Confessions can be heard before the earlier Mass, and catechism is given to some 250 at most of the 600 children of school-age—the rest escape, even now, all Catholic influence. However, within the less-than-a-year of his presence there, Father X had many consolations.

Thus a benefactor has promised that a church and a presbytery shall be built next year—in my heart I hope, *part* only of a church; for, it seems inevitable (thank God) that such new churches require to be doubled after five years, in size. Moreover, an enterprising and generous Congregation is hoping to build also next year a school for 400 juniors and infants, though even so they will shepherd but two-thirds of the local little ones. Still, here, too, we may foresee extension.

The real necessity for "halls" in the proximity of churches and schools is far better recognized to-day than it used to be. I have actually heard people call them "non-conformist," thinking I suppose that men could live on grace alone. No. If we starve upon bread, we are not meant to live as though discarnate. It can truly be said—as Father Bernard Vaughan used incessantly to plead—that people like those of whom I have been talking have *no home*. The Hall becomes, on its plane, as necessary as the church on the purely spiritual plane. It is tragic to have to say so, but too often, even in districts like this one, the best thing you can do is to keep inhabitants out of their homes so long as possible. A Hall alone can supply opportunities for the social, domestic and

recreative sides of existence which are, after all, most of life, and which require to be pervaded with religion, rather than to be tacked on to it, as though they were a regrettable sort of extra that one is exempted from attending to. I know that over-crowding is prohibited—in the parts that I am talking of—perhaps successfully, though I doubt it. In other districts, it can be deplorably evaded. Will these pages tolerate a true tale? A girl was going to become a mother. I asked her if the father couldn't help. "But who is he?" "Haven't you any idea?" "Well, it might be my regular boy, or one of the others, or either of me two brothers. . . ." For heaven's sake, let us not be religiously dainty. At least we most of us have houses. Let us wait, if we wish to condemn, till we know what it is for parents and three smaller children to sleep in one room, and two grown-up sons and two grown-up daughters to sleep in the other, neither room having space for even the gas-ring, which is outside. If I cannot say the truth in *THE MONTH*, where *can* I say it? And if we cannot say it, we shall go on living in a fool's paradise, if so criminally ignorant a demesne can be called "paradise" in any sense. . . . Stated it must be; for, else it were not known; and till we know, we cannot so much as hope, let alone achieve. Personally, I think almost the best thing that the Holy Child Settlement in Poplar has done is to have built a club with a very large, flat roof, wired in. Here babies can play, out of the street with its microbes and its lorries; and here, too, older lads, whole evenings at a time.

I would wish Father X, therefore, to build his Hall concurrently with his Church, and for this purpose to receive (if it is to become a true club as well) £3,000. He can do it with that. For this, I don't deny that I would gladly receive offerings and hand them on to a special Hall-fund. Else, the young men and women of his district have nothing to do but idle. If one could realize the awful *boredom* that this involves, with consequent restlessness, and in many temperaments, need of adventure, and, very often, quite unnecessary sin. If that Hall-Club existed, a great deal of the 66 per cent "leakage" would be checked; and since there is at present no competition, it would win friends to right and left. I know that some would regard with horror the admission of non-Catholics, in any case, into such a Club. Whether they would locally be allowed or not, is not my business. How-

ever, the haunters of by-ways and hedges were "compelled" to come in to the Marriage-Feast, certainly not *kept* out. The lord of that house, given the go-by by his friends, did not shut himself up and make a solitary meal, putting anything left over in cold storage. . .

Lest it should, all the same, be thought that this preoccupation with a Club-Hall is relatively secular, Father X is very anxious to open at once a Catechism House. A tiny house has, in fact, been taken, where two or three ladies can live—a young lady, I hear, has offered to do the whole of the housework for the first month anyway. The ladies there expect to manage on £200 between them, but this income has to be ensured to them, and I think that this will be possible. For, the Catechism House (and, please God, the future Settlement) has a *permanent institution* to back it. This is the Convent of the Holy Sepulchre, New Hall, near Chelmsford. Poplar, thank God, has behind it the permanent backing of the convents of the Holy Child; so have missions in Nigeria. Behind missionary work in China, Japan, Egypt and the Congo, are the Nuns of the Sacred Heart. On the Institute of Notre Dame many a mission in Northern and Southern Rhodesia can rely. Now New Hall is but a single convent-school, though a very well-known one. It could not envisage being of very substantial use to some foreign country many times the size of England. But it *can* envisage its own diocese, or one district within it. And it has generously and very rightly fixed its eyes on Dagenham and is beginning with this Catechists' house. It has by no means been proved, as yet, that it can do the whole job—provide even that preliminary £200 a year that I mentioned, without, moreover, diminishing its established charities, which it certainly would not wish to do. I should say it would be wise to foresee helping only in part this new house, and in that case, others would have to come to the rescue, for, I feel certain that neither Dagenham, nor even Brentwood diocese, can ever finance themselves adequately from within. But in any case, the children of New Hall Convent are among the Privileged. They live among trees and fields that the children and women of Poplar or Rotherhithe may see but once a year and almost feel lost in. Their house is of ancient mellow brick, where Dagenham is so raw,—solid Tudor brick, instead of the flimsy plaster. Is not their responsibility almost painful? Will they not feel each brick, each leaf of their haunted elms, a reproach, until

they have "built Jerusalem" in those bleached and bloodless lands of the New England so close to them? The Holy Father says that the breath of self-sacrifice that he sees sweeping over the world affects the *young* most strongly. And we know that in many a school that Wind is blowing.

Dare one not also hope that the call to penance, sounded in that same Encyclical, may be answered throughout the whole Catholic Community? Not only in our private lives, but in our social one. I would wish all Catholics to do without expensive weddings (always, to my mind, an affected, if not pagan, orgy), and devote what they *would* have spent before the social shrine, at God's altar—that is, in helping places that cannot possibly help themselves—and I repeat, I have used Dagenham only as a symbol. I would like the wave of austerity to affect those, too, who insist that schools shall be the luxurious places that they have become—by this I mean, are ready to spend money on the obviously needless, so as to vie with their own past or with some other school. I can think of schools in which about eight "blazers" have to be got sooner or later during the course: to my mind, pure extravagance, and, interfering with better things. That a child should ask its parent for a gift, on behalf of some need that really has aroused the child's enthusiasm (and who more generous-hearted than children?) and have to be told that it cannot be given because the sixth "blazer" of its school career has just then had to be bought! Harrow School recently put up carved and painted coats of arms, proper to distinguished persons or families connected with the place: I was asked to help: with scruple and real reluctance did I do so. If I had to solicit half a crown—detestable job at best—would it might have been for something I could have cared about! For the price of that panel I could have knocked down some wretched priest's interest by at least £2 a year!

I believe we can go further. A priest lamented to the Holy Father that he had not money enough for his campanile. "Build churches," answered the Pope. "Many, strong, and dignified. Campaniles can wait." Apart from most of our church-ornament detracting from the dignity of churches, rather than adding to it, I would suggest that we should forgo all but the necessary minimum of decoration, for the sake of the churches that do not exist, must exist if souls are to be saved, and cannot. Here they always quote the criticism on the outpoured scriptural ointment. But observe—Judas called

it "waste," not in the least because he wished to give it "to the poor," but to steal it. When our Lord said that she had used it in view of His burial, He emphasized thereby that His words were in regard of a quite exceptional situation: to-day, His Presence is Sacramental and not visible: it cannot be withdrawn from us as His visible presence was: but, it *can* be prevented from so much as being present at all, if there be no church or tabernacle to receive it. Even when people truly urge: "Nothing is too good for the Lord's House"—would that all churches were more beautiful than they are!—still, there is order even in worship, even in love. I would rather do even a little for those Shrines that souls should be, than much for the adornment of a wood or marble shrine. I do not say that necessity will always be upon us as it now is: but I daresay that "penance" is not out of place, even if we deny to our eyes the pious pleasure of a statue we have given, for the sake of those souls in some desperate parish, whom we shall never see till, with astonished vision, we recognize the worth of our work in paradise.

C.C.M.

[NOTE. We yielded to second thoughts, and asked the Editor's permission to place the page-Appeal in each number of this issue of THE MONTH. The second part of the article becomes little more than a commentary on it. We are glad to mention that we have already about £25 towards that £3,000 needed. One one-hundred-and-twentieth. . . Believe me, with determination, that £3,000 can be got in three years. But I do not think it, or many similar necessary things, will be done, till we develop the realization of that tremendous war—now "hidden from the eyes" of so many—already being waged between our Faith and Russian Atheism. I hope to develop this later on. As it is, districts such as I have described offer the most perfect terrain for a victorious expansion of revolutionary atheism: its forces are acting there intensively: active Catholic speakers and teachers are certainly needed—may we, who cannot play those parts, at least provide the *material equipment* without which they are badly crippled.]

AN OLD-TIME OXFORD CONVERT

THE city of Oxford has now its three Catholic churches, and a chapel of ease; two University halls, for Benedictine and Jesuit undergraduates, respectively; a Franciscan foundation and a Dominican priory; a Catholic-Workers' College and a University Chapel for Catholic undergraduates; besides some five convents, including those which make it possible for nuns to attend lectures in the University. All this burgeoning of Catholic life is in striking contrast to the state of things revealed in the reminiscences of a village convert who migrated to Oxford over fifty years ago. Even in some country parts of Oxfordshire there is a modest but marked Catholic advance. Eynsham is a centre which radiates apostolic activity; while from Bloxham through Hook Norton down to Charlbury, where a church has already been opened, there is a regular system of catechetical centres with an organized transport to take isolated Catholics to the nearest church, until it becomes possible to build and serve additional churches. Against this brief record of progress stands out the enmity to the Church, and the unreasoning fear of its influence, that was once experienced by an old member of the staff of Trinity College on his conversion half a century since. To point the contrast he has been persuaded to set down the following account of his conversion.

"Born in a country village, with a population of not more than three hundred souls, my surroundings were naturally rather narrow. However, there was a beautiful old church in the village, a pre-Reformation fane dedicated to St. Bartholomew: it contained a 'piscina,' which a devout old parishioner informed me had been used by wicked Papists in olden days to pour away the blood after their sacrifices. Another remnant of superstition was a large niche in the wall of the church, which the same authority described as the place where one of their gods stood,—a woman whom they used to worship. In the tower, on one of the bells, was a relic of the language the deluded worshippers had used in their prayers, 'Sancta Anna, ora pro me.'! The Sunday services at this church of the Establishment were morning prayers and sermon, and afternoon prayers and sermon. The aged rector

—a great preacher of the blood-and-thunder type—delivered sermons of over an hour in length. The choir consisted of six or seven aged men who performed on flute, clarinet, violin and 'cello. In a church that had been locked all the week, where the congregation was composed of hard-working country folk who had just had their one hot dinner of the week, no more inappropriate hymn could have been chosen than that constantly selected for the afternoon service, 'Oh may sweet sleep mine eyelids close.' But there was a rude awakening for those who slept. A parish clerk who had succeeded his father and grandfather in office, had at hand three ash sticks of varying length. Suddenly, one of these, carefully selected, would crash down on some offender's head, with the admonition accompanying the blow, 'Young man, wake up and listen to the blessed word of God.' When I commented wonderingly on this activity to my godmother, she told me that once, when listening to the famous preacher, the Rev. Rowland Hill, she saw him suddenly lift up the huge pulpit-bible and drop it on the head of a man who had fallen asleep just under the pulpit, saying as he did so, 'Young man, if you will not hear the word of God you shall feel it.' The sermons we heard were compounded of the terrors of eternal punishment, the urgency of missionary work, especially among the poor benighted Catholics in Ireland, and the horrors of the coming Armageddon, in which the Pope of Rome, the Beast of the Book of Revelations, was to be destroyed and cast, together with his Church, into Hell, after which universal peace would reign on earth.

The celebration of Holy Communion took place four times each year, at Easter, Whitsun, Michaelmas and Christmas. On these days the Communion table was completely covered with a white linen cloth, in the centre of which stood a mound that aroused my boyish curiosity. After the sermon all but the communicants left the church. Exceptionally I was allowed to remain, but it was impressed on me that on no account must I leave my place. The procedure was strange. Beneath the napkin was a paten piled with small dices of bread: beside the paten stood a flagon of wine, and two chalices. When the time came for the communicants to approach, the clerk stood sentinel at the chancel entrance, and in an audible whisper called, 'Squire and family. . .' 'Rectory family. . .' 'Farmers and families. . .' 'Park and Rectory servants. . .' 'Now, you poor people.' Boy as I was this

last term made me feel quite sad, chiming so strangely as it did with Christ's love and predilection for the poor.

This Rector was succeeded by his son, a sincere man and less strait in his arranging of the services. Celebrations of Holy Communion became more frequent. Then the Squire's wife presented the church with a one-manual organ, the canticles were sung to double chants, and Hymns Ancient and Modern introduced. This gave dire offence to the ancient choristers, who mutinied, and were promptly superseded. Though only thirteen, I was promoted by the new Rector to the charge of a class in the Sunday School. With my parents' consent, I had six or seven of the boys on two nights a week during the winter in my father's bakehouse. I knew little myself, having left school at eleven years of age, but somehow my pupils improved in writing and spelling; and then I read to them—the Rector's choice—the "Pilgrim's Progress," and "Foxe's Book of Martyrs." The former has always struck me as the wonderful work of an illiterate man; the latter I remember being held in honour almost as an inspired book.

Within a few months of my fourteenth birthday I was confirmed in W— church by Dr. Samuel Wilberforce. Many anecdotes are fathered on him: I may perhaps recall two which may be less well known, but which one heard often repeated in those days. A farmer, walking from church over a treacherously icy road, slipped and fell. The bishop, going to his assistance remarked with a smile, 'Ah, Farmer, the wicked stand on a slippery place.' 'Yes, my Lord, I see they do, but I can't.' On another occasion, commenting on the genial spring weather to a farmer, the bishop remarked, 'This should bring everything up quickly.' 'I hope not,' said the farmer. 'Why?' 'Well, your Lordship, I've two wives buried in yonder churchyard, and I don't know how I'd manage if they were both restored to me!' My confirmation was one of the incidents that had a considerable bearing on my future churchmanship. The chief part of the Rector's preparation of the candidates had been instruction in the catechism and the Thirty-nine Articles, with special stress laid on their Protestant interpretation. At the service the Bishop urged, in his two addresses, the importance of following up good resolutions with the aid of regular Communion, monthly at least, if possible, weekly. For me this was a new doctrine which I was only too grateful to receive. A fortnight later, Sacrament Sunday, I approached the Rector and told him

my desire to communicate. The good man looked grieved and sad, as he told me how much he regretted not being able to allow me to communicate—it was too serious a matter to let a boy of fourteen communicate. He said that this was a point on which he differed from a practice already springing up in the Church, a practice quite at variance with Protestant teaching.

Soon after this my mother died, and as I had given up the idea of following my father's trade, I came into Oxford to make my own way in life. This was in 1874. A strange offer was made to me at this time by a lady of some means, who wished to see me educated for the Wesleyan ministry. This was a tempting offer, and had it been the Anglican ministry that was in prospect, I should have probably accepted her offer gratefully. But conditions were attached to her offer which made it appear, on consideration, less single-minded. She was notoriously eccentric, and her daughter—ten years my senior—had all her mother's lack of balance and more! After my training, and ordination to the ministry, I was to marry the girl and allow the mother to make her home with us! My ministerial training never began!

The first four years in Oxford went by quietly. As acquaintance with Church after Church was made, the want of unity in teaching and ritual was painfully borne in on one, yet great love for the Church of England remained. The local clergy were very friendly to me as a newly-joined member of the Churchmen's Union, but soon the bitterness existing among them was apparent. I was a candidate for the post of School-Board officer, and it became a matter of securing the casting vote of the chairman, a local clergyman. He sent for me and, learning that I attended a well-known ritualistic church, he informed me that I would not get his vote lest I should advise parents to send their children to High Church schools.

A curate at St. Giles's, and soon to become a Cowley Father, the Rev. Luke Rivington, was at this time attracting many by his preaching. I made his acquaintance and told him how I had been refused Holy Communion as a young lad. He instructed me and heard my confession, and gave me my first Communion, at St. Giles's. Some years later, I met him, but under different conditions for both of us, in the sacristy of St. Aloysius's church. How I came to St. Aloysius's is a strange story. The church was then in course of

erection, but I had never looked inside it, nor had I ever entered any Catholic church, and this out of a sense of loyalty to the English Church. A dream came to me that I was kneeling in a strange church where I saw a lamp burning before the altar. No service was going on, but many people were kneeling there, and one by one they entered and emerged from doors on the right-hand side of the church. Presently a priest in cassock and biretta and purple stole came down the church and beckoned to me and showed me into one of the doors. He joined me and in a moment I found myself making my confession. He then sent me to wait for him in the church. Again he came, but this time was wearing a cotta as well as stole and biretta. He took me to a side chapel and, after a short ceremony, said, 'There, my child, now you are in the one fold.' I said, 'Thank God; I could not have died happy in the Church of England.' So far, my dream.

In the morning I narrated it to my wife whom the very telling of it horrified. Some months after, I met the priest of my dream; we looked at each other: I was positive it was he. Again I told my wife, but she ridiculed the idea. Things followed their ordinary groove until the following Christmas week. It was vacation, and an old friend of mine in college said to me, 'You know Father Clarke who used to be at St. John's?' 'Yes,' I said, 'and admire him very much.' 'Well,' he said, 'he is preaching at St. Aloysius's to-morrow night and I should like to go and hear him, shall we go together?' 'No, I will never go into a Roman Catholic church,' I replied. But my friend laughed at my scruples and insisting that if he, a Low Churchman, had no hesitation, how could I have who attended a ritualistic church. Eventually I agreed to go with him. Never shall I forget my evening in that church. It was the church of my dream. Father Clarke spoke on Our Lord as the Light of the Gentiles. He knew that in his audience were some who had formerly listened to him in the church opposite, St. Giles's, and he urged on those in any doubt the duty of simple and trusting prayer which would surely win them light. When I left the church, with the music of the Litany ringing in my ears, I was torn between conscience which said, 'your going to that church was a temptation of the evil one, to lure you from the truth,' and the urgent advice of Father Clarke to pray, pray, pray. The following morning, New Year's Day, I went, as usual, to Communion at St. Giles's and prayed sincerely for light. On

going into Trinity College about ten in the morning, I met my companion of the previous night, who asked if I would call and see Father Clarke for him. It seemed that he had in his keeping certain things belonging to Father Clarke, who, on being deprived of his Fellowship at St. John's when he became a Catholic, had been welcomed as an honorary Fellow of Trinity. My friend was about to leave the college and desired to ascertain Father Clarke's wishes respecting his property, which included the oar with which he had rowed in the Oxford boat against Cambridge. I undertook the message, and after the business in hand had been transacted, Father Clarke said, 'I saw you in church last night.' 'Yes,' I said, 'my first visit to a Catholic church.' He said, 'I hope it will not be your last.' The ice was broken, and I poured into his kind, willing ear my doubts, my position, my love, at the same time, for the Church of England, and the bitter opposition I should meet from friends, if I contemplated becoming a Catholic and the fact were known. 'We all have a similar experience who take the step. I felt it bitterly, but, my dear friend, remember the words of our Master, "He who loves father, or mother . . . more than me cannot be my disciple."' Then he pointed out that, as Our Lord was evidently calling me, and I alone could give the answer, constant prayer for grace was essential. He gave me the catechism to study, and as he was leaving Oxford in two hours, he said he would introduce me to a man who would help me in every possible way, and whom I need have no scruple in approaching. He went out of the room, and returned in a moment or two with a priest whom I at once recognized again as the priest I had seen in my dream—it was Father Parkinson.

Suffice it to say, that in the following February I was received into the Church. The details of my dream were carried out to the letter. It was Saturday night, confessions were being heard, Father Parkinson came down the church and beckoned to me, and so on in the order described. Then came the inevitable severance of old friendships and old associations. There were reproaches from friends and relatives, that hurt as such things must. But, in spite of all, a feeling of calm assurance made me happy in my choice. Interior peace there was, but, outside, there were the usual assaults on the convert's constancy. A Protestant newspaper, *The Rock*, gave me the following notice :

A junior servant of Trinity College has lately seceded

to the Church of Rome. The only reason that can be given for the rash act of this infatuated youth is the fact of Cardinal Newman being an honorary Fellow of the same college.

This note looked as though an effort were being made to injure my position in Trinity. Father Clarke, however, saw the words in question, and wrote to me, advising me to pay no heed to them as he had sounded the college authorities as to the probable results of my step and was told that a man's religion was a man's private affair, in no way to be interfered with by his employers. The aged widow of my old Rector sent for me and with tears implored me to reconsider the step I had taken. I could not know how serious my position was. She would not go so far as to say that there were no Roman Catholics in heaven, but she feared that there would be very few. She reminded me how I was separating myself from my beloved mother, and all that I loved on earth. I parted from her sad, but in no way shaken. She sent Canon Christopher, a dear old Christian, but a bigoted Protestant, to use his influence to snatch a brand from the burning. He, in turn, sent his scripture reader to chop texts with me. When, however, as a final argument, the latter informed me that, on becoming a Catholic, my marriage was by Papal law null and void, my patience was exhausted, and I politely showed him the door asking to be excused further visits from his Rector or himself. Lastly, there was a titled lady, accustomed to give religious addresses, who, after her talk on one occasion, when I happened to be on the outskirts of the crowd she was addressing, came to my side and, as I had been pointed out to her, asked me earnestly if my soul were given to the Lord. I in turn asked her why she put such a question to me. She replied that her love of souls urged her to preach the Gospel, and had not the great Apostle said, 'How can they hear without a preacher?' I asked her to finish the verse, 'How can they preach unless they are sent?', and reminding her of the same Apostle's injunction to women to keep silent in church, asked her who had sent her with authority to preach, and what proof of her power could she offer? She said that she feared I was a scoffer, but she would pray for my conversion. I thanked her and told her the prayers of a good man or woman I ever respected, and we parted.

In 1880, Cardinal Newman preached two sermons in the church of St. Aloysius. He had just been made an honorary

Fellow of Trinity, where he was the honoured guest of the college. As a Catholic I was asked if I would like to attend him, an offer I hailed with pleasure. When he learned I was a convert he took my hand and tears ran down his venerable face. 'Thank God I have seen this day. They turned me out of Oxford because I embraced the Faith, and now I am delighted to find a Catholic college servant.' He expressed a desire to see the room he had occupied as a scholar sixty years before. I went with him. He walked to the window and looking out said, 'Ah! there is the snapdragon growing on the wall just as it did in my day. I used to stand at this window and read.' Then, looking round the room, he exclaimed, 'Oh! how changed everything is, turkey carpets instead of boards, easy chairs, sofa, piano, and pictures, but not many books. We had table and chairs, and no superfluities, only our beloved books.'

Once again, when I found myself in the neighbourhood of Birmingham, did I see the Cardinal. When I called at the Oratory, the priest who met us was Father Eaglesheim, formerly curate of St. Paul's, Oxford, the clergyman who officiated at my wedding. He feared there was little chance of the Cardinal, then very aged and weak, receiving anyone, but he would see. The answer was, 'I must see anyone from my beloved Trinity.' We were very kindly received, and much talk passed about Trinity men, and then the Cardinal dismissed us with good advice and his blessing."

E. COX.

The incidents leading up to a conversion such as has been narrated are not without their interest. In many parts of the country Protestantism is still as ignorant and as intolerant as it then showed itself at Oxford, and converts have to face the same reproaches from their illogical friends. We may add that this old convert, who has but recently gone to his reward, had the pleasure, shortly before he died, of having a little drama of his own composition—"Campion,"—with prefaces by the Master of Champion Hall at the University, and also by the University chaplain (himself a Fellow of Trinity), produced with great success in the city he had loved so well, for that modest triumph seemed to him to crown the great advance which the Faith had made in Oxford since his own conversion sixty years ago.

R. GORMAN, S.J.

BELLARMINE AND THE "SACRAMENTAL PRINCIPLE"

ALTHOUGH THE MONTH has published several articles in exposition of the character and merits of St. Robert Bellarmine, notably that which, after the Saint was proclaimed a Doctor of the Church, Archbishop Goodier wrote and entitled "Bellarmine: Defender of the Faith" (June, 1931), it may be of interest to dwell more particularly upon the main principle which gives unity to all his theological thought and preserves its utility to our own day.

For the Saint was first and last a practical theologian. His interest in theology was a pragmatic one. He wanted the Truth to prevail. The Church indicates that fact in her description of him as *strenuus fidei Catholicae defensor, haereticorum malleus*. His business was to defend the Faith against the attacks of its actual contemporary enemies, and since he found them opposing the Faith all along the line, he also fought them all along the line. However, he did not go about his work in a haphazard manner, nor in the spirit of a merciless belligerent. He had a well-thought-out plan of attack, for unless he had such a synthetic conception of his work, his defence, like the attacks which it met, would have been casual, disconnected, dissipated, evanescent, instead of being, in its main outlines, a solid unified instrument of practical and permanent value. His aim was, according to his own words, "to treat all the controversies separately and yet in relation to each other; to show their points of contact and mutual dependence; and so from them to build up one coherent organized and complete body of doctrine."¹ In a word, he explicitly meant his work to be a synthesis of Catholic defence.

Where can one find the key to this synthesis?

For answer we must consider his main work,—that work of defence against the "Reformers" of his day. If we know for certain what those Reformers stood for, we shall have the key to Bellarmine's thought.

In contemporary heretical writings, the issue is very much obscured. Luther and Calvin, Zwingli and Carlstadt rebelled

¹ Brodrick, "Life and Work of St. Robert Bellarmine," Vol. I., p. 192.

because they had come to an aprioristic decision on what constituted religion. But they could not, although Luther came near it, advertise themselves as Apostles of a *new* religion. They had to justify their rejection of the old by representing it as the natural conclusion of a long and laborious research into Scripture and Tradition. Difficulties from Patrology, Church History and Bible-exegesis occupied a large place in their attacks. But these pretences were only a blind. They should not blind us. They did not blind Bellarmine.

The Lutheran doctors of Magdeburg examined the ecclesiastical traditions century by century, and tried to show, from extensive and original investigations, that antiquity was solidly against the claims of contemporary Catholicism. The appeal to history was a new thing—and new brooms sweep clean. The Catholics were concerned to answer the "Centuriators," whose volumes dealing with the early Church were doing immense mischief. St. Philip Neri commissioned his gifted disciple Baronius, then only 21, to undertake the task, but his lectures on Church History, which, under the name of "Annals," finally discredited the "Centuriators," did not begin to appear till 1588, fourteen years after the thirteen volumes of the "Centuries," which began in 1559, had been completed. Meanwhile, Bellarmine had been appointed, in 1576, to the Chair of Controversy at the Roman College, and found in the "Centuries" a useful compendium of heretical errors. His lectures did not see the light till some ten years after the completion of the heretical appeal to history, but when they did, they proved to have been well worth waiting for. Just as the "Bible-only" champions forced him to answer their objections drawn from Scripture, so the Magdeburg scholars gave him occasion to vindicate Catholic truth by means of history and tradition. It was a new field of combat and required new weapons, but there was nothing original in the spirit of the fight. Bellarmine could see the old mentality behind its smoke-screen of erudition. He knew exactly where lay the capital error of the Reformers, viz., in their very concept of the Christian Religion.

The Reformation called itself a "Godward" movement. But it sought God in unwarranted ways, not the ways revealed and prescribed by God Himself, but in ways condemned as heretical in early ages. The main error of the Protestant was the main error of the Marcionite and the Manichee, of the Priscillianist and the Paulician. The Protestant said, in the

sense of the Priscillianist: "God is a pure spirit. Therefore, God is to be reached in a purely spiritual way. I do not want creatures however holy, institutions however good, sacramentals, scapulars, images and indulgences to intervene between God and me. I can go to God without the aid of mummery." And so, ignoring his own composite nature, he rejects God's provision for salvation and becomes a Manichee in his contempt for the material. Yet it is absolutely certain that God Himself created all matter and created it precisely because He meant all material things to help man to reach his final beatitude. The Protestant fought so vehemently for the absolute spirituality of religion that he seemed to forget that God meant him to attain to the Beatific Vision as man, composed of both body and soul. In emphasizing the spiritual he forgot the supernatural. Though familiar enough with the Devil, he did not realize that not everything spiritual was godly.

Historically, the Reformation began, not as a new religion, but as a rejection of parts of the old. Some Reformers rejected more, some less, but all seemed agreed in rejecting this one thing: "the superstition of the Scarlet Woman seated enthroned on the Seven Hills"—the "superstition" that the only salvific way is the sacramental way, that the only religion revealed by God, from Adam down to Abraham, from Moses down to the Machabees,¹ from Jesus down to the last days of John, was a religion founded on the natural, whereby external, visible and material elements were to produce in men supernatural, interior, invisible and spiritual effects in order to equip them, body and soul, for the unending bliss of heaven.

Of course, the Reformers did not enunciate their denial in such clear terms. Clarity was not their strong point. Even had they seen the logical trend of their various denials, they had not the courage to go the whole way. Whether it was blustering Luther or subtle Zwingli, or gloomy Calvin or time-serving Cranmer, all were essentially compromisers. There were only two groups of Reformers who had the courage to go almost all the way in the Great Denial—the Anabaptists and the Schwenkfeldians. We know how the Anabaptists were butchered by the Lutheran princes, egged on by Luther himself. We may read of the almost Athanasian wanderings of Kaspar von Schwenkfeld, persecuted by his

¹ Cf. Bellarmine: *Opera omnia* (Paris Edition, 1870), Vol. III., pp. 358, 453-468.

fellow rebels. But even Anabaptists baptized, though only adults; even Schwenkfeldians kept the sacraments, though as mere symbols. No Reformer had the full courage of his convictions.

However, whatever their practice, in theory, at least, all of them denied the sacramental principle, the doctrine that God leads men to heaven in a human way, consonant with his nature—and man is neither a beast nor an angel, nor even an angel imprisoned in a beast, but man is essentially body and soul, matter and spirit, the invisible and the visible, joined together by God Himself to form one complete whole. The denial of this principle is the Protestant heresy.

It is the assertion of this sacramental principle which is the central feature of St. Robert Bellarmine's teaching. It is from the vantage point of this stable and fundamental truth that Bellarmine looked at the whole range of theology in general and at Church-defence in particular. However adroitly the Protestant might cover his tracks, Bellarmine would follow him, tear down one after another his various scriptural and patristic defences and at last lay bare the sorry fact that Protestantism was a man-made, man-guaranteed creed, not the religion of the Bible or of Christian tradition. Bellarmine comes to this conclusion again and again in almost every discussion, whereby he proves that Protestantism denies this sacramental principle and that this denial is its basic error.

For instance, at the beginning of the first volume of the "Controversies," the question is raised whether the Scriptures are in any way useful for salvation. The Schwenkfeldian and the Anabaptist say that, as "the letter killeth," the Scriptures should be abolished so that the spirit may prevail. Bellarmine immediately replies that our nature, as it is constituted of body and soul, requires that we should be led on to spiritual and celestial things by means of what falls under the senses, and that, in actual fact, God Himself asks us to use the Scriptures as a necessary means of salvation.¹

Again, in the third book of the same volume, he asks whether any special interpreter is needed for the right understanding of the Scriptures. The Reformers all hold, at least in theory, that any man can interpret aright the Scriptures if he has "the spirit." Bellarmine replies "which spirit?", and then shows, from the mutual contradictions of the Re-

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. I., p. 70.

formers themselves, that their spirit is not the Spirit of Truth. Finally, he concludes that, since we are corporal beings, a visible corporal interpreter is needed.¹

Similarly, the next book discusses whether divine tradition can be kept pure. The adversaries are at very great pains to show that a legacy, not written down in black and white and registered, is liable to be irretrievably lost. When one reads their finely-spun arguments on the need of a written tradition, one wonders why they thus limit the power of God to effect His purposes. Bellarmine's answer is an obvious one: our God is living in His Church, and His providence secures that His revelation does not perish. Without that providence even the written Word of God would not be safely transmitted. Documents can be and have been forged. Not all is "Gospel" that is written on parchment or printed in books. And—here comes the usual conclusion—God has committed the doctrines He wished to preserve, not to some inanimate receptacle for anyone to ransack, but to four well-recognized, visible repositories: the writings of the Fathers, the rites of the Church, the sacred edifices, the continuous dogmatic teachings of the Church progressively evolved against the perpetual attacks of the heretics.²

In the second volume (third book) the human Nature, and especially the human Body of Christ, are dealt with. The Schwenkfeldian, and his inseparable cousin, the Anabaptist, deny the physical reality of Christ's Body, whilst the Lutheran disputes its entire humanity. Both errors are Manichean. God cannot become a real man, because it is unworthy of God to assume into His own Personality what is material and, therefore, in some way, base and evil. The answer Bellarmine makes is simple: Matter, being created by God, is essentially good, hence, there can be nothing unworthy in God's free association with it.³

The "Sacramental" system is similarly prominent in the third volume—on the right of the Holy See to rule the conscience of Christendom. The Protestant denial is based on the assertion that the Church has Christ for its head, and so does not need a Pope. On plea of safeguarding His rights they would deprive Him of the means of visibly controlling His Church. If you can put Christ out of sight you more easily keep Him out of mind as well, and pay as little heed

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 169, 176, 187.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 369, 400.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 228—231.

to Him as you choose. God the Invisible King, requires, under human conditions, a visible vicegerent. Bellarmine mildly vindicates the Catholic's loving and direct obedience to His Lord. "We recognize," he says, "Christ to be our only king and head, though we hold that the Church, because it is corporeal, visible and one, needs one visible head. Nor is this derogatory to Christ's claims, since He Himself made the arrangement, and history has shown the need of it."¹

The question of General Councils, closely connected with that of the Papal Primacy, is brought to the same test. Most of the Reformers rejected all General Councils as usurpations of the office of the Holy Spirit, but others demanded them as a check on the arbitrary rule of the Pope. Bellarmine answers both by showing that General Councils are not the only God-given means to save the Church. Absolutely speaking, the Pope can rule the Church without their aid. But normally Papal decisions are not dictated by the Holy Spirit direct, but rest on the discussions of the "Ecclesia docens," summoned for the purpose. The Pope is no Protestant, to exercise private judgment. He, too, "hears the Church," and is guided by what he hears. According to the ordinance of Divine Providence, the Pope cannot govern the Church *well* without the Councils.²

"Who are the members of the Church?" is the next question discussed. The Reformers emphatically affirm that only those in whom the Spirit works belong to the true Church. Again, an appeal to the unknown, a rejection of the visible and tangible. Bellarmine grants that those who love God supernaturally, belong to Him, but, since Christ established His Church as a corporation, there must be some visible sign or signs of membership, viz., the rite of initiation, the profession of the Church's faith, the acceptance of the Church's pastorate. The various parables in which Christ sketched the character of the Church show that it is not confined to the good.³

As regards the Sacraments, most of the Reformers admitted one or more Sacraments as warranted by Scripture. But Bellarmine asks: What is the use? since they place the sole efficacy of the Sacraments in the faith of the recipient and not in the prescribed rites.⁴ Here, especially, he insists upon the "Sacramental" principle. In any scheme of salvation for

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 479, 485-486.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. II., pp. 210.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 318, 343, 346, 352.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. III., pp. 336 sq., 396.

men, Sacraments are necessary, in the sense that they are in harmony with the needs of human nature, and he frequently quotes with approval this sentence of St. John Chrysostom :¹ "If you were an incorporeal being, God would have given you unadorned incorporeal gifts, but because your soul is joined to the body, God gives you spiritual gifts through objects of sense-perception." The Sacraments do produce in our souls supernatural effects. And to Calvin's sneering comment on this doctrine—"In that case God has resigned His prerogative to act internally, in favour of certain external ceremonies," Bellarmine replies : "Yes, if one can say that the carpenter, using a saw, surrenders to that instrument his power of cutting wood."²

It will now be clear without further multiplication of instances what is the standpoint of Bellarminian theology. It is found everywhere in his works, now implicitly, now more explicitly, now in one form of enunciation and now in another. The whole of his theology is based on this principle.

God created heaven and earth. God created human beings in whom the body is not an alien substance somehow adhering to the soul to keep it down, but rather, a substantial and essential part of man. Having created men, God gave them the means of knowing and loving Him by surrounding them with objects which reflect His beauty and other attributes. In and through the contemplation of these objects men might have reached a state of blessedness, commensurate with their natural capacities.³ But God, however, wished them to reach a more perfect union with Him and so, raised them by grace to the supernatural order.⁴ After the Fall, through misuse of the natural, came Redemption by means of the natural. God might have redeemed by an act of will not visibly extenuated. But He chose a human way, which the sense-bound creature could see and appreciate. He was born of a woman into the human family. Henceforward, the way of a purely spiritual religion was impossible. God is attainable only through the God-Man. *Nemo venit ad Patrem nisi per Me*. The Incarnation set the seal on the sacramental principle.⁵ God became the babe of Bethlehem, the boy of Nazareth, the man of Galilee, the crucified on Calvary. He shed His heart's last drop of blood to show men in a human way how much

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 394, 332, etc.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. VI., pp. 8, 40.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. VI., p. 151.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 421.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. V., pp. 173, 176.

He loved them. He was a true man, died a true death. But that was not to be His end, because death was not to be our end. He rose again from the grave with His human body, the exemplar of our own resurrection. All this was only the beginning of our salvation from sin. Even after the sufferings of Jesus, our Brother, God might have applied them for our forgiveness on our interior repentance. But no; even the distribution of these treasures of mercy had to take place in a human way.¹ Matter and form He instituted the Sacraments, water to wash us, bread to feed us, oil to strengthen us for the great journey of life and for the greater journey of death.² Again, God could have ruled His flock by private interior illuminations. But He wished to rule His people as a spiritual kingdom, made visible as a terrestrial one. Therefore, He instituted Peter, the visible Head, to be the centre of authority, and to confirm his brethren, the Episcopate. They, too, were to elect their auxiliaries by a visible call.³ They were to judge the sinner and pardon him in a visible tribunal.⁴ After the divinizing of human nature in the Incarnation, all the actions of men, however ordinary, could be sanctified, as done for God by members of Christ's Body. The most "natural" of all, the union of man and woman for the propagation of the race, was actually given the power and dignity of a Sacrament, a means of sharing God's own nature and of peopling Heaven.⁵ Whether we eat or drink, whether we live or die, we remain enmeshed in the salvific scheme of God, which is the sacramental scheme. This is the basis and background of Bellarminian theology, culled from the tradition of the Church, but given point and force by constant contrast with the root-negation of Protestantism.

And, naturally enough, it pervades his other writings as well. It is found frequently in his book on the "Duties of Christian Princes."⁶ It is the burden of many of his sermons against the brainless mysticism then in fashion, and against the Puritan practices of the Manichees. It recurs in his ascetic and devotional works and in his discourses on our Lord's Life.⁷ It is the theme of the whole treatise on the Ascent of the Mind to God; "per scalas rerum creatarum."⁸

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. IV., p. 360; cf. Vol. III., p. 446.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. III., p. 352.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. V., p. 23; cf. Vol. II., p. 424.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. IV., pp. 458, 490 sq.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. V., p. 49.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Vol. IX., pp. 93, 215, 260, 271, etc.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Vol. VIII., pp. 91, 95, 114, 146, etc.

⁸ *Ibid.*, Vol. VIII., p. 240.

And writing "On Eternal Happiness" (in five books) he develops the idea that even heavenly joys will affect body as well as soul, and not be wholly dissimilar to true felicity on earth.¹

What he taught in this emphatic way, the Church had always taught and still teaches. The merit of Bellarmine was to diagnose the essential evil of the Protestant system, the separation of individual doctrines from the whole, and their development irrespective of the rest—the common practice of the heretical spirit at all times—and to show how orthodoxy harmonizes with common sense. It is the doctrine that permeates the whole of the Spiritual Exercises, which teach such entire detachment and such contempt of the world as such, yet begin by insisting that "all things on the face of the earth are created for the sake of man that they may help him to tend towards his final end," and end by indicating how the love of God is to be sought and found in and through the creatures which are His handiwork and His agents. He discovered that, implicitly at least and all but universally, those that rejected the Catholic Faith, ancient, mediæval and of his own time, went astray on this point, and, misled by Puritanism and blinded by Pride, tried to reach God by unauthorized ways.

"These things ye should have done, and not neglected those." Everything has its due place in the Catholic synthesis. The sacramental use of things does not prevent, but rather fosters, direct contact of our souls with the Holy Spirit. The Catholic is in no danger of idolatry or of magical practices, so well is he trained to see God in His creation and His ordinances. He prays,² in the words of the Preface for the Nativity, that the sight of his God in the Flesh may enrapture him with the love of the Unseen. Bellarmine as a theologian, as a controversialist, as a preacher, as an ascetic, as a saint, used this world indeed but as one who passed beyond its pleasures and its pains. The very last words of the very last work he wrote, showed the atmosphere of hope in which he habitually passed his life—"For our present slight distress worketh out for us, ever more and more fully, an eternal weight of glory, while we look not at the things that are seen but at the things that are not seen."

M. L. BALAM.

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 365, 371, etc.

² *Ibid.*, p. 622.

BRAILES: AND PENAL TIMES

WHERE the three counties of Worcestershire, Warwickshire and Oxfordshire meet, in the very depths of the wooded hilly country that Shakespeare knew, lies the historic Catholic mission of Brailes. It is a village with one street, and even that seems to be in a hurry to get away from the houses, to resume its more dignified rôle as the Shipston-Banbury Road. In fact, the only remarkable thing in the village is the church, with its great square tower, 165 feet high, which is built on a slight eminence and can be seen for miles around. This is as it should be, for Brailes has hardly any history which is not connected with the church, and its only claim to renown is the story of heroic men and women, who lived and suffered so much there for the sake of the Faith they loved. Here, in this little village, we find worked out again the joyful, sorrowful, and glorious mysteries of the Church's life.

Brailes used to belong to Edwin Earl of Mercia, but it was confiscated by William the Conqueror, who gave it to Henry de Newburgh, Earl of Warwick. At that time it measured forty-six hides, and was noted for its woods. The parish church was erected during the reign of Henry the First, when Roger Earl of Warwick gave a piece of land for its site to the Augustinian Canons of Kenilworth. For three hundred years and more they remained its patrons. It is a fine big church, far larger than the needs of Brailes would demand to-day, but then, called "the Cathedral of the Feldon," it served all the many hamlets round about. It is dedicated to St. George, and we note with interest that Henry the Third gave special leave for a fair at Brailes on the eve of the Saint's feast. The church to-day has been much restored, but the beautiful decoration within, the font and the old sedilia, are eloquent witnesses of the generous faith of mediæval England. The old village had its gild, and in 1322 Thomas de Pakington founded a chantry, with two priests to say Mass daily over his father's grave. There was no shortage of priests then, some quarter of a century before the "Black Death," and Brailes could boast of over five. So from the Norman Invasion until the Reformation, for a period of wellnigh five hundred years, Mass was celebrated daily in St. George's Church, and the Angelus-bell sounded across the Feldon,

reminding the villagers of God Incarnate and His Mother Mary.

When Henry the Seventh established the Tudor dynasty, the lands of the Warwicks passed into the royal hands, and from that date the Manor of Brailes is frequently mentioned in State Papers as being leased, or temporarily granted, to some nobleman to whom reward was due. Among those who acted as Steward of Brailes, the name of Sir William Kingston appears, that knight who, as Governor of the Tower of London, received Blessed Thomas More into custody, and who presided at his martyrdom. Towards the end of Henry the Eighth's reign the Crown sold the property at Brailes, and, after it had changed hands several times, it was purchased by William Sheldon, the head of that great Worcestershire family, which did so much for the Catholic Church in her desolation. So at the very time when the monks were being suppressed, the Church at Brailes was provided with new defenders. The Sheldons had a large house near by at Weston, with a private chapel of their own, and it is probably from there that the beautiful vestments, still used at Brailes, originally came.

In 1538 Kenilworth Priory was yielded to the royal robber's demands, and the parish church at Brailes saw the Canons no more. The first rector after the change was one Richard Bishop, who, according to a tradition, was appointed priest in charge by the prior of Kenilworth when he learnt of the approaching suppression. Certainly, the Bishop family was known to the Kenilworth community, for at its suppression the priory owed money to one William Bishop, probably a brother of the priest. How the Bishop family came to Brailes is nowhere recorded, but at this time they lived at the Rectory Farm, a fine old house some two hundred yards from the parish church. The house, altered in part, still stands to-day, and it is a notable relic of a great Catholic family which worked so loyally in penal times for the Church, and which gave England her first Vicar Apostolic, in the person of Doctor William Bishop, first Bishop of Chalcedon.

The change of religion was achieved at Brailes as quietly as in most places in England, and the simple people did not well understand the alterations that were made. An interesting letter in the State Papers at least shows us that there was some opposition at the time when the monasteries were suppressed. Sir John Hoddylston writes to Thomas Cromwell

that he is forwarding him a song against the King and his vicar, which he had taken from a man who said he had learned it from the minstrels at Brailes. The chantries at Brailes were abolished and the money devoted to a county-school. Finally, after the accession of Elizabeth, ministers of the new Anglican Church took the place of those belonging to the old religion.

However, the Faith lived on in the Rectory Farm at the bottom of the hill. There is a tradition that Father Holt, the Jesuit, laboured in these parts. Whether he ever came to Brailes we do not know, but others of his kind certainly did, and the little attic chapel of Our Lady, the soiled but precious vestments still preserved, and the priest's hiding-place behind a cupboard with a false back on the main staircase, all witness to the loyalty of the Catholic gentry during these hard times. Few written documents concerning them have been preserved, but the traditions of the place are many. At least three times the pursuivants came to the Farm to hunt for priests. On one such occasion, it is related, the priest they sought, who fortunately had a horse, had time to mount it and get away, though not unobserved. Galloping out of the village he came to the toll-gate, his pursuers some few hundred yards behind. The gate was locked, but at the approach of the priest it was opened by some mysterious hand, and immediately locked behind him. In the delay thus caused, for the Queen's officers had to rouse the gatekeeper from his bed, the priest made good his escape. Another time it chanced that in the evening, about dusk, a priest was surprised at the Farm, and he ran for dear life along the Banbury Road to where the road branches, the left leading to Banbury, the right to Mine-Hill Farm. When the pursuivants came to the junction they descried on the left branch a running figure, which they followed for half-a-mile when, to their amazement, it suddenly vanished. Meanwhile their quarry was out of sight along the other path.

It was about the year 1553, when Queen Mary was on the throne, that there was born a son to John Bishop and Alice, his wife. The boy was called William, after an uncle, and he was the heir to the estates. At seventeen he went to Oxford, now Protestantized under Elizabeth, where he may possibly have met Campion, since the latter left the University in 1571 on account of grave doubts about the new Church. William Bishop did not stay long. Almost immediately after graduation, he gave up his inheritance to his brother and crossed the

seas to Rheims, where he was ordained priest in 1583. He returned to England with several other priests in the same year, but was arrested on landing and, after a year's stay in the Marshalsea prison, was exiled. In no way put off by his first failure, after taking his doctor's degree at Paris he came back and made his way to Brailes, where he laboured for several years, living with his father and his brother Barnaby. One Richard Williams, a treacherous servant, informed against the family for having Mass said, and we find in the Record Office a report of his evidence. "He says that one Bishop, a Warwickshire man, whose father is worth 400L. a year, often comes over. In Bishop's house at Wolvered are kept priests who say Mass there and at Ralph Sheldon's. The witness has been present. Mr. Thimbleby also, who was to marry Sheldon's daughter, also the brother of Bishop, one of the priests, who is a son to Bishop of Brailes."

To return to William Bishop. In 1594 he left England for Rome to represent the secular priests in their discussions with the Jesuits, where he was detained for a year. He then came back to his mission work, till in 1611 he was again arrested and deported, since he refused to take the new oath of allegiance. In exile he once more took a share in the controversies of that time. Among other works he produced, "A Reproof of Mr. Doctor Abbot's defence of the Catholike reformed by Mr. Perkins." Dr. Abbot was not silenced by this, and so William Bishop again opened fire on him with "Disproof of Dr. Abbot's counter-proof against Dr. Bishop's reproof of the defence of Mr. Perkins reformed Catholic."

In 1623 William Bishop, then seventy years of age, was raised to the episcopacy as Bishop of Chalcedon, and first Vicar Apostolic of England. The old hierarchy being long extinct, it was his privilege to inaugurate the new and to lead the Church in England in her slow progress towards the normal. His appointment was popular among Catholics, though the Puritans were on the watch to prevent his coming back to England. Come back he did, in spite of them, but he was an old man now, worn out by the fatigue of his hard missionary life, and he died in London in April, 1624, nine months after his appointment.

Meanwhile, his brother and family at Brailes maintained their loyal devotion to the Catholic Church. His old father had died in 1601 at the age of ninety-two, and lies buried in the family vault beneath the choir of the parish church at

Brailes. His son Barnaby duly succeeded him, and he, too, was a generous defender of the Faith. We know that Father Anthony Sherlock, a secular priest, was chaplain for four years at Brailes, soon after the arrest of the printing-staff at Stonor Park. There is also a grant made out to Sir Richard Coningsby in 1607, "allowing him the benefit of the recusancy of Barnabas Bishop of Brailes in lieu of £1,000 due by the king to Coningsby for surrender of his grant of licensing merchants to export tin"—an odious example of the manner in which royal James was wont to pay his debts. Through the courtesy of the Vicar of Brailes I was allowed to see the old parish registers, which contain the names of many generations of the family in the direct and collateral lines from 1585 to the beginning of the Nineteenth Century. Out of the multitude only one or two of the more remarkable need be mentioned here.

Several of the boys of the family went over to Douai, and three actually became priests. Father George Bishop, born in 1695, had a distinguished career at the Seminary. He returned to Brailes and in 1726 opened the present Catholic chapel. It is a barn at right angles to the main structure of Rectory Farm, and the ground floor is still used for agricultural purposes. The chapel, tastefully decorated but still easily recognizable as a farm building, occupies the next storey. Over the Altar, which is now surmounted by a baldachino, there used to be a square cut in the ceiling, through which the Altar could be hauled on pulleys into the loft above when Mass was over. Through the loft the priest, too, could escape, and reach the hiding place in the Rectory Farm.

The other two young men of the family who were ordained, Francis and Henry Bishop, went to Douai together in 1737. Francis became a secular priest and was stationed at Enstone, near Heythrop. He died in 1821 at a great age, and his body was carried back to Brailes. He is the last of the Bishops to be buried under the choir of the old church. His brother Henry did not persevere at Douai, but, having fought with the Irish Brigade at Fontenoy and been seriously wounded, he decided to join the Franciscans. He laboured at Wootton Wawen, another Warwickshire village, for many years. Nor were the weaker sex amongst the Bishops any less fervent. Two or three went abroad and joined the Poor Clares, while one, Elizabeth Bishop, became a martyr, if not for the Faith, at least for Christian virtue. This brave girl at the age of

eighteen sailed for Ostend with the intention of becoming a nun. At the Belgian port she was molested by a lewd young nobleman named Douglass, and when she refused his advances, he handed her over to the English authorities for breaking one of the laws against Catholics passed in William and Mary's reign. She was put on board a vessel, the *Deutschland*, bound for England, but in a storm the boat collided with Ostend Pier, and she perished along with fifty other passengers.

After the year 1821, in which Father Francis Bishop was buried, we find no more references to the Bishops of Brailes. The property passed into the hands of the Bedingfeld family as the result of a marriage, and now the chapel belongs to the Archdiocese of Birmingham, though the Rectory Farm has passed from Catholic hands. The Bishop family, I believe, no longer exists, though in the colonies and even in England indirect descendants may still be found. But the Bishops will never be forgotten. Their tombs are conspicuous in the parish church. In the Catholic chapel their vestments, with their crest embroidered on the chasuble, are still used, and in the sacristy, among the old miscellaneous volumes, you can still find the books used by the young Bishops when at school. Most permanent is the chantry they once more established in the chapel in the barn.

The little chapel still serves its purpose after two hundred years. Bishops Challoner and Milner gave Confirmation there to the great grand-parents of the congregation of today. For Brailes, although its great church was alienated so long ago, has kept its faith steadfastly and the same names can be traced back in the registers to penal times. The spirit in this little Catholic colony is amazing. There are in all eighty. Each night they meet before the Lady Statue to recite the Rosary, and to say night prayers. There is a little Catholic school, which is supported by the Parish without a Government grant.

On Corpus Christi this year there was a procession of the Blessed Sacrament. To the sound of hymns and the peal of bells the Sacred Host was carried past the Rectory Farm, with its attic chapel and its hiding place, and up the street till it reached the Parish Church. And as the canopy went by, one could not help thinking that, after experiencing the Joyful and Sorrowful mysteries of the Faith, Brailes had now had its share in the Glorious.

BERNARD BASSET.

THE HEALING HAND

II. PRINCE VON HOHENLOHE

EXAMPLES were not lacking in the eighteenth century of people who, like Greatrakes a hundred years earlier, laid claim to a natural gift of healing. Perhaps the best known of these was a certain Bridget Bostock who, for a short period, caused a considerable sensation in the county of Cheshire where she lived. In the year 1748, the pretensions of this seemingly quite uneducated woman were discussed by various correspondents in *The Gentleman's Magazine*. That people crowded to visit her is certain; but that any remarkable cures were effected through her agency is by no means so clearly established as in the case of "the Stroker," Greatrakes. The witnesses who speak in her favour are not men of recognized standing, and for the most part their names are withheld. A correspondent, writing from Middlewich, first broaches the subject in these terms:

There is risen up in this country a great doctress, an old woman who is resorted to by people of all ranks and degrees, to be cured of all diseases. She lives four miles from hence, and has been in this great fame about two months. She has several hundreds of patients in a day out of all the country round for fifty miles. I went to see her yesterday out of curiosity, and I estimate that near 600 people were with her. I believe all the country are gone stark mad. The chief thing she cures with is fasting-spittle and "God bless you," with faith.¹

From accounts in the Nantwich papers, reproduced in the same journal, we learn that though "she had all her lifetime made it her business to cure her neighbours of sore legs and other disorders," Bridget's reputation during the twelve months preceding had wonderfully increased. The writer of the notice speaks in enthusiastic terms and tells how:

Sunday sen'night after dinner I and my wife went to this doctress's house, and were told by Mr. S— and Tom M—, who kept the door and let people in by sixes and sixes, that they had that day told off 600 whom she had

¹ *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 1748, p. 413.

administered to, besides making a cheese. She at length grew so faint, for she never broke her fast till she had done, that at six o'clock she was obliged to give over, though there were then more than sixty persons whom she had not attended to. Monday last she had 700, and every day now pretty nearly that number. She cures the blind, the deaf, the lame of all sorts, rheumatism, King's Evil, hysteric fits, falling fits, shortness of breath, dropsy, palsy, leprosy, cancers, and in short almost everything; and all the means she uses for cure are only stroking with fasting-spittle, and praying for them. It is hardly credible to think what cures she performs. Some people grow well whilst in the house; others on the road home; and it is said none miss. People come from sixty miles round. In our lane where there have not been two coaches seen before these twelve years, now three or four pass in a day; and the poor come by cart-loads. She is about 70 years of age, and keeps old Bostock's house, who allowed her 35 shillings a year wages; and though money is offered her she takes none for her cures. Her dress is very plain. She wears a flannel waistcoat, a great linsey apron, a pair of clogs, and a plain cap tied with a half-penny lace. So many people of fashion now come to her, that several people can make a comfortable subsistence by holding their horses. In short, the poor, the rich, the lame, the blind and the deaf all pray for her and bless her; but the doctors curse her.¹

Naturally, such encomiums provoked contradiction. Other correspondents wrote in a very different strain. They said that the doctress was dirty, they said she was stupid, they said that none of the sick people who went to her really experienced any relief. On the other hand—and the point is of some importance—they do not seem to have said that she was making money by an imposture. Moreover, it was stated that the Rev. Mr. Harding, "the minister of Coppenhall" (the parish in which she lived) gave her a very good character, and we are told that this Mr. Harding's son "was cured of his lameness by her immediately after he had been with her, when all other doctors could do him no service." None the less, the same writer admits that "many got no benefit," though he also reports that a Mrs. Gradwell of Liverpool

* *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 1748, p. 414.

"hath wonderfully recovered her sight" by a visit to Copenhall. How long the excitement lasted I have been unable to learn; but another correspondent writing from Oxfordshire in 1749, describes how three people had gone from Thame to be cured by Bridget Bostock "who has now taken a great hall house."¹ Two of these experienced no benefit, but the third, who was suffering from a pleurisy in her side, declared that she was cured. It is plain, at the same time, that the change of air and a journey, which probably, as they went by cart, took a week or more, would be quite sufficient to account for this.²

I have, therefore, no inclination to lay any stress upon the cures which are attributed to the doctress of Copenhall. Her story is mainly interesting as an illustration of the readiness with which any report of marvels of healing may cause a sensation, resulting in a vast confluence of people, some few of whom will almost inevitably experience benefit from the changed conditions of life involved in such a journey. Neither must it be forgotten that the pleasant notoriety which waits upon the "miraculé" may often encourage an hysterical subject to affect an improvement which is not by any means in strict accord with the facts.

But my main purpose in the present article is to consider the case of a later and much more famous personage³ whose cures were effected not only in his own presence, but hundreds of miles away in every part of Europe, and even beyond seas. Prince Alexander Leopold Franz Emmerich von Hohenlohe-Waldenburg-Schillingsfürst, to give him the full style which would be accorded in such a manual as the *Almanach de Gotha*, was born in 1794, at Kupferzell in Würtemberg. He was, from early years, remarkable for his piety, and following the example of an uncle of his, he made choice of an ecclesiastical career. After completing the necessary studies he was, no doubt with due Papal dispensations, ordained priest at the early age of twenty-one by his uncle, then a bishop. No reproach seems ever to have been whispered against Alexander von Hohenlohe's character as a priest save that he was an extreme ultramontane, and for that reason, as well as for his practice of healing, incurred

¹ It should be remembered that "hall" in Lancashire and Cheshire means no more than a farm house with a big room.

² *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 1749, p. 343.

³ He was so far celebrated that a short separate notice is consecrated to him even in the latest edition of the "*Encyclopædia Britannica*."

some unpopularity among the clergy of Munich. In 1824, owing to circumstances which need not now detain us, he got himself transferred to Hungary, and there, after holding various positions of dignity among the canons of Grosswardein, he was, in 1844, consecrated auxiliary bishop in that diocese. After an illness which did not prevent him from interviewing 16,000 sufferers in 1848 and 1849, he died in the November of the latter year at Vöslau in Austria.

It must, I think, be counted for righteousness in anyone of the social position of Prince von Hohenlohe that at an early stage of his life as a priest he formed a lasting friendship with a devout peasant, one Martin Michel, a man twenty or thirty years older than himself. Martin, during long years of illness, which had incapacitated him from work upon the land, had reached the conviction that only an ardent faith was needed to obtain a cure. However it came about, he was in fact restored to health, and then, believing it to be the call of God, he set to work to cure others. He had a brother-in-law, a priest, in whose church Hohenlohe came to preach, but it seemed impossible that the sermon could take place owing to an acute affection of the throat which the Prince had contracted. Hereupon Martin Michel urged that he could be made well if he had sufficient trust in God. They both prayed, the peasant, it seems, massaging the other's neck and throat, and the sudden and complete cure which followed made an immense impression upon Hohenlohe. Just at that time, as it happened, he was brought into contact with the very sad case of the young Princess Mathilde von Schwartzenberg. She had for eight years been a complete cripple through some paralytic affection, which was complicated by ulcers and other troubles. She had been treated without success by doctors in every part of Europe and was fastened down in some contraption which her surgeons had contrived in the hope of giving relief to her aching limbs.¹ Von Hohenlohe's own account of what followed runs in these terms :

On June 21st, while saying Mass, I found myself moved to tell the Princess that she would have help from Jesus Christ if she could put faith in His divine words, "Amen I say to you, whatever you shall ask the Father in My name, He will give it you." On my return to the sacristy, I endeavoured to rid myself of the idea as pro-

¹ The course of the illness is recounted in some detail by Canon L. Sebastian, *Fürst Alexander von Hohenlohe* (1918), pp. 38-41.

ceeding from an excited imagination. My efforts were useless. The strong impression remained that I ought to go to the Princess and take Martin Michel with me. So I went, and leaving Michel in the ante-chamber, I proceeded alone to the apartment of the Princess, whom I found lying down and held fast in some sort of mechanical apparatus.

After polite greetings on either side, I said to her, without further preamble: "My dear cousin, God is able to help you through Jesus Christ His Son, in whose holy name we address our prayers to the eternal Father." "Yes, undoubtedly," she replied, "I believe that." I then said to her: "I have brought with me a pious peasant, at whose prayer Almighty God has already succoured the afflicted. If you are willing, I will fetch him that he may pray for you." "With all my heart," replied the Princess. Whereupon I called to Martin Michel to come in.

Then, with a few words to the invalid, Martin, putting his hands together, knelt down and began to pray. But one needs to have seen him to form an idea of the intense fervour which animated him. I appeal to those who have been present on any such occasion. All would agree with me that his prayer came from the fullness of a heart penetrated with the most living faith. For my own part, I threw myself on my knees to join my petitions to his. The prayer ended—I could not tell the reason, but I felt a secret power which commanded me to say to the Princess in a loud voice: "In the name of Jesus Christ, arise and walk." I pronounced these words, for ever memorable to me, and the Princess, released from the bandages of her machine, was able not only to rise to her feet, which she had not done for eight years, but to walk. Thou knowest, my God, how deeply my heart was moved at the sight. I felt my tears flowing, but I was only able to utter the exclamation, "My God, my God! is it possible?"¹

This was the first of the cures attributed to Prince Hohenlohe, but owing, no doubt, in large measure to the high rank of the young lady benefited, it excited a prodigious sensation.

¹ I take this from a French translation, "*Mémoires et Expériences dans la Vie Sacerdotale*," 1836, pp. 55—56. The original German, which Hohenlohe published at Regensburg in the same year, under the title "*Lichtblicke*, etc." I have not seen.

The Prince himself, from that day forth (June 20, 1821), seems to have been convinced that the relief of sufferers was the special work committed to him by Almighty God. Two days later, quite a number of invalids were appealing to him for help, and though there is no mention in the case just related of any physical contact, it would seem that at first he did lay hands upon those who were brought to him. He claimed no personal gift of healing, and always attributed any favourable result to prayer and to the faith of the patient, but as early as June 25th of the same year we have an account of a deaf woman who came to ask his assistance, and it is expressly recorded that after an imposition of hands, and prayer, he bade her stand up with a certain tone of authority.¹ There is also a contemporary drawing, reproduced by Canon L. Sebastian in the volume he has devoted to the subject, which shows the Prince, attired in a costume which we should not now recognize as distinctively ecclesiastical, laying his hands upon an invalid who is kneeling before him.

The records preserved of these, his early efforts in healing, are strangely contradictory. On the one hand, we hear of immense crowds who came to him and who, as we are informed, were all relieved, if not entirely cured,² but on the other, we have quite explicit statements regarding a visit to the Julius-spital at Würzburg where he attempted to treat eighteen patients in the presence of the doctors with no success at all.³ That there were hundreds of poor sufferers who besieged him and kept him busy all day long is established beyond the possibility of dispute, and the same was no doubt true of Martin Michel. As was to be expected, these proceedings were looked at askance by the medical faculty. They not only expressed their contempt for such a display of superstition, but they loudly proclaimed that these pretended faith cures ought to be put a stop to. Their representations were not without effect, and on August 3, 1821, Michel was forbidden to undertake any treatment of the sick in Baden, and nine days later a similar prohibition was issued which applied to the whole of Bavaria. This led to the adoption both by Michel and by Hohenlohe of a somewhat new procedure. They no longer interviewed the sufferers who had recourse

¹ "Der Fürst liess sie niederknien, legte ihr die Hände auf, betete einige Minuten über sie und befahl ihr dann aufzustehen." Sebastian, p. 47.

² See the contemporary letters of Canon Baur. These were translated and published in English in February, 1822, *i.e.*, within eight months.

³ Sebastian, pp. 48-49.

to them, but no legal enactment could prevent their praying for them and bidding the invalid to have faith, and upon an assigned day and hour to unite his intention with theirs. Hohenlohe's method, beginning with the latter part of 1821, was to write to the sick person a few lines recommending a boundless confidence that their prayers would be heard, together with a fervent reception of the Sacraments. He announced the precise day and hour at which he would pray for the sufferer in his Mass, and in some favoured cases he seems to have suggested a novena, promising that he would make a memento himself both at the beginning and end of the nine days. It also sometimes happened that Father Forster (who acted as the Prince's secretary and who lived to carry on the work after the death of His Highness) added a note mentioning that Martin Michel would unite his intercessions with those of the petitioner.

There must, we may be sure, have been hundreds of cases in which no cure was effected, and in which the patient was not conscious of any perceptible amelioration. Naturally, these excited little attention. The worthy souls who were disappointed in their hopes had no motive for advertising the fact. But there were, on the other hand, here and there, some astonishing instances of recovery in quite desperate conditions. These, if only out of a motive of gratitude to God, were noised abroad, and were appealed to by Catholics of the day as conclusive proofs of the holiness of the Church in which the miraculous powers of healing, as promised by our Saviour, were still verified. Quite a vast literature for and against the genuineness of these "miracles" rapidly accumulated. The subject was debated not only in Germany and on the Continent, but also in the United Kingdom and even in America. In England one of the cases which attracted most attention was the cure of a novice in the Convent of New Hall, near Chelmsford, on May 3, 1822. The Protestant physician who attended the case published a pamphlet on the subject.¹ The mischief had begun in December, 1820, with a poisoned thumb, Inflammation of the whole arm, with

¹ "An authentic Narrative of the extraordinary Cure, performed by Prince Alexandre Hohenlohe, of Miss Barbara O'Connor, a nun in the Convent of New Hall, near Chelmsford; with a full refutation of the numerous false reports and misrepresentations, etc." By John Badeley, M.D., Protestant Physician to the Convent, London, 1823. The "false reports" amounted to this, that the supposed cure was an imposture contrived by the nuns and that Miss O'Connor had never had anything the matter with her. On the other hand Dr. Badeley repudiates the idea that the cure was miraculous.

much pain in the axilla and manuna, had followed. Numerous incisions had been made, many different treatments had been attempted during the best part of eighteen months without any notable relief. On May 2, 1822, Dr. Badeley "found the hand and arm much swollen and as bad as he had ever seen them; the fingers looked ready to burst, and the wrist was fifteen inches in circumference."¹ When Mass was over, the nun was able to use her hand and arm in a way that had been impossible to her since the beginning of her illness. Dr. Badeley's pamphlet, which quickly went through three editions, excited a certain amount of attention. The *Quarterlies* took the matter up, and the *Edinburgh Review* for October, 1823, published a slashing article on superstition in which the writer called Hohenlohe "either an Enthusiast or a Hypocrite," referred to him as the "Prince Impostor," and spoke of this "Chief Conjuror, who performs incantations at Bamberg and appoints a day for curing all the diseased in Ireland." The reference to Ireland was occasioned by two pastorals which had appeared about the same time, the one by the famous Bishop Doyle of Kildare, describing the cure of Miss Lalor who had been for six years deprived of the power of speech; the other by Archbishop Murray of Dublin, in which an account is given of the paralysis with complications of a nun of St. Joseph's Convent, Ranelagh, which had lasted for four and a half years, and was cured instantaneously at the moment that Prince von Hohenlohe was offering Mass for her a thousand miles away.²

All this happened at a time when the agitation for Catholic Emancipation was becoming very keen, and when anti-Papistical feeling on the part of its opponents was proportionately inflamed. In those days little was understood about neurasthenia, and the power of suggestion. The claims made for these cures seemed very surprising, and the average Protestant could think of nothing better by way of reply than to attribute them to malingering or organized imposture. There

¹ In an interesting letter from the nun herself to Dr. Milner (see the *Catholic Miscellany*, Vol. II., p. 538), dated 4th December, 1823, and therefore 18 months after the cure, she states that on the day before the marvel took place she was told that amputation would have to be resorted to. She adds that "the fetid odour from my hand and arm was so offensive" that the surgeon insisted on special ventilators being constructed in the room. We also learn that the swelling began to subside at once, had before night diminished by five inches round the wrist, and had completely disappeared in four or five days.

² Both Pastorals, with the certificates of doctors and sworn depositions of witnesses, will be found reprinted at length in the *Catholic Spectator*, Vol. I (1823), pp. 259 seq. and pp. 269 seq.

cannot, however, be a shadow of doubt that some sufferers—they may have been relatively few—were marvellously restored to health owing to their having put themselves in communication with Prince von Hohenlohe. A rather striking case is one which appeared in *The Times* for June 30, 1823. The communication ran in these terms :

Sir,—If you think the following facts of sufficient interest to insert in *The Times*, when public news may not press, I send them exclusively to you as original. I will give you the names of the parties, which will prove to you that there is no deception ; but I must request you to withhold them from the public eye, as well as my own name :

SUPERSTITION THE BEST DOCTOR

The eldest daughter of a French lady, residing in Bouverie Street, has been afflicted with a most severe and excruciating nervous complaint for the period of eighteen months. When she attempted to leave her bed the depending posture of her legs produced the greatest agony . . . , and after the attempt she would be for several hours suffering from acute hysterical flatulence, distention and violent headache. In short, her agony was extreme, and she became completely bedridden. She was constantly bedewed with clammy perspiration, her face was exanguine, her body emaciated. The most eminent physician in this city attended the young lady ; by expostulation and entreaties he endeavoured to rouse her to exertion, by medicines and diet he strove to correct the deranged state of the system, but to no purpose ! Six days after his last visit, he received a long letter from this young lady, stating herself to be perfectly recovered. She had written to Prince Hohenlohe. He ordered her to say Mass thrice and pray for him at the time he would pray for her, and after the third Mass she would be restored to perfect health. The attempts to kneel down at the first two Masses were prevented by the tortures usually experienced in trying to quit her bed. Dread and apprehension lest she should lose the chance of recovery enabled her to perform genuflexions at the third Mass, though her attempts to quit her bed were equally excruciating. She rose quite well after her last devotions.

An editorial note is appended as follows :

In conformity with the wish of the writer, we withhold his name; he is, however, an eminent physician, and he has given, as vouchers of his statement, the names of two other physicians of the very first rank.

The account is interesting if only for the extraordinary ignorance of Catholic practice betrayed by such a phrase as "he ordered her to say Mass thrice." Moreover, I fancy that it is typical of the majority of the cures with which the Prince was credited, while the story will now excite no surprise in those who have even the most superficial acquaintance with the pronouncements of modern pathology regarding hysteria. But the very fact that an eminent physician thought it worth while to send such a case to *The Times* shows that in those days the public at large was blissfully ignorant of matters which are now quite commonplace.

One of the most famous cures attributed to Prince von Hohenlohe took place in the United States. It was that of Mrs. Anne Mattingly, the sister of Captain Thomas Carbery, then (1824) Mayor of the city of Washington. She had also a sister who was a Carmelite, a brother who was a Jesuit, and the account in *The Catholic Spectator*¹ which I follow, seems to have been penned by another Jesuit Father of Georgetown College. In accordance with Hohenlohe's instructions, a novena had been made to the Sacred Heart, during which the Litany of the Holy Name of Jesus was daily said. It was to end with the Mass which the Prince would celebrate at Bamberg on March 10th. Owing to the difference of longitude, the Masses which were offered at Washington in union with his, had to be said at half-past three in the morning. Communion was taken to Mrs. Mattingly at four minutes past four, and we are told :

At the moment of receiving the Blessed Sacrament (which, her tongue being quite parched and dead-like, she could hardly effect) she rises up in her bed, and lifting up her two arms, one of which she had not been able for a long time even to move, she exclaims—"Lord Jesus, what have I done to obtain so great a favour? What shall I do to acknowledge so great a benefit?" asks for her clothes, dresses herself, sits up, throws herself down on her knees with the priest, the Rev. Stephen Dubuisson, who had given her the holy communion, and who

¹ Vol. II. (1824), pp. 169—170.

was prostrate on the ground, lost in a transport of admiration and gratitude, then rises, walks through the room, and on that same morning took as much food as she had taken for the space of six months previous . . . received in that day perhaps a thousand visitors, and on the following day more than two thousand, shaking hands with everybody, smiling, laughing, conversing the whole day, and from the ghastly, emaciated, livid semblance of a dying person, in which state I saw her at about six o'clock of the evening before, restored to an angelical countenance. . . All the physicians who attended her, solemnly declared that the nature of her distemper was entirely out of reach of medical assistance. During the above-mentioned nine days' devotion, she became worse every day—was considered on two different occasions to have expired, was at the point of death when I saw her at six o'clock in the evening, and even worse at ten o'clock the same night, when visited by the Rev. Mr. Matthews, Rector of St. Patrick's church at Washington city, and was literally at the point of death in the opinion of more than ten respectable persons, when, at the moment of receiving the adorable Sacrament, she was restored in as perfect a state of health as I who am writing or anyone who may read this letter.

I have no thought of excluding the possibility of the intervention of a supernatural element in this or in other similar cures which it would be easy to quote, but I fear that such a case would not now be accepted as a first-class miracle by the Bureau des Constatations at Lourdes. Prince von Hohenlohe was undoubtedly a good man who, throughout his life, gave evidence of a deep and earnest piety. But the very enthusiasm he inspired in those who championed his cause lends them an eloquence which, as I strongly suspect in the instance just quoted, invests with a golden hue all the circumstances they detail and would, under medical cross-examination, prove them to have left a good many weak points out of consideration. The biography of the Prince, written in 1918, by Canon Sebastian, commits its author to the view that the marvels of which we there read are all capable of a quite natural explanation, while at the same time it shows that an imposing reputation as a thaumaturgist may be attained by one who achieves a very small proportion of permanent and verifiable cures.

HERBERT THURSTON.

IS "RATIONALIZATION" RATIONAL?

THE term "Rationalization" provides an excellent example of the modern fondness for catachresis, a deceptive abuse of language. The Press, with its powers of mass-suggestion, is expert in bullying the public into attaching a meaning to a word which is not verified in fact, and once the word is thus wrongly applied, the perversion of ideas, of which the words are the mere vehicle, becomes an easy matter. Thus, fanatical teetotallers attempt to attach a stigma to good drink by calling it "liquor," or, worse still, "alcohol." It is exactly as if we were to call tea "tannin" or coffee "caffeine," and everybody who drinks tea a "tannin-addict." In the same fashion, "free love" is the word used to cloak unbridled lust; a creed that ignores fundamentals is called "fundamentalism."

So the word "Rationalization," applied to industry, is used to pre-suggest a system that is particularly and especially rational, based essentially on common sense, made to accord most closely with the dictates of pure reason. And it should, of course, mean the organization of industry on a basis which is not sentimental or careless or haphazard, but which involves the choice of the fittest means for the highest end.

However, both in practice and in theory, the word is used to cover quite other meanings. In practice "Rationalization" means centralization and concentration, presumably on the assumption that these are the only reasonable processes in industry. Because so many big businesses in an industry are in difficulties and their profits are not big enough, let us make still bigger businesses and all will be well. Because the control of a shaky industry has become concentrated in a few hands, let us concentrate it into still fewer. Because the public is deterred from buying by high prices and trade is bad, let us stop competition by getting together and fixing the prices as high as we like.

Nor is the theory of "Rationalization" any more rational. It is supposed that by co-ordination between various companies in an industry, either by uniting them all into one large corporation or forming an amalgamation of directorates for co-ordinate action, it will be possible to eliminate waste

in the duplication of services, such as advertising and selling, waste in competition which absorbs a firm's activities in various directions and reduces its profits by price-cutting, and waste in overhead administration. "Rationalization" is supposed to make possible closer co-ordination between various branches of an industry, cheaper buying of raw materials, and standardization of products, with a consequent extension of mass-production and a cheapening of the process. But the theory is irrational because it does not take account of all the elements in the problem. It leaves out human nature.

One of the great dangers of the big firm or combine is that it may become unwieldy. However well organized the business may be, it is physically impossible for the head of it to keep an eye on every part of it. And the bigger the business, the fewer men in it have the stimulus of personal gain and personal control. Whereas, when there are several small businesses, there are several small heads or directors, each a king in his own small way, taking a personal pride in the success of the business, and taking the bulk of any access of profit that success brings. In the large business, the interest in many parts of it has to be devolved upon paid employees, and however faithful they may be, they cannot have quite the same keenness for a success for which they share responsibility and credit with many others, and for which they can expect but a fraction of the profit, in the shape of a rise in wages or promotion. In the "rationalized" industry, even the directors of big combines become to some extent employed persons, sharing responsibility and success with others under one head, who gets most of the "kudos," though chosen from amongst themselves. Is not this, you may ask, an approach to the Christian ideal of brotherhood, impersonal service, and co-operation, which politicians and go-getters are wont to preach to the public while they pick its pocket? In practice it is nothing of the sort, for it would surely demand a Utopian disinterestedness that even the most charitable of us knows does not characterize the successful business man. Christian unselfishness would be disastrous to modern Big Business, as any school of business efficiency will tell you. Unflagging interest, fed by personal gains, is the hall-mark of the good business man. But, lacking that motive, interest is apt to flag. This is not to say that there is not real keenness even amongst employees of the big combines. But it is

naturally less common. Places at the top of the ladder are fewer because there are fewer ladders. It is fine and inspiring for the successful head of a large concern to tell the world proudly how he rose from bottom by his own efforts, and to add that every other employee of his can do what he did. The five thousand other employees may be stimulated to imitation for the first year or two, but sooner or later it dawns on them that there is something wrong with the mathematics of that speech.

This factor of personal interest in the members of any industry is of prime importance. It largely determines the value and productivity of their labour. There is no stimulus like personal profit, and this varies with the amount of control; which naturally is greater the smaller the business. Indeed, in virtue of this principle most of the big businesses have been built up. It is the exceptionally keen individuals that have responded most to the stimulus of personal gain, and thus have extended their opportunities. We must admit that many of them have used other aids to success than mere enthusiasm and hard work,—certain equivocal practices which the struggle for existence is held to condone, such as "double-crossing" friends and competitors, and dealing in "a business-like manner" with the misfortunes of rivals. This is not to say that all the very successful have thus condescended to the tricks of the trade. Nor that many have practised conscious fraud. It is well known that by a curious religious perversion success in business is often regarded as a sign of God's election.¹ And some, no doubt, have had business greatness thrust upon them without their seeking it. We must not be rash in judgment. If a new figure is cast on the shores of finance with his pockets bulging with gold, it is not for us to say that he pushed his comrades off the raft: they may have been washed away whilst he slept.

Let it be understood by the reader that in this matter we are considering a phenomenon of Big Business, not of moderate-sized or small business, for "Rationalization" is an effect of Big Business at its biggest. Whether or not the successful man has needed luck or business instincts in addition to his genius and industry, it would seem that Christian morality, at any rate, if we may judge from the lives of the many Captains of Industry, would have been more of a

¹ See "Calvinism and Big Business," *THE MONTH*, April, 1932.

handicap than a help. Though it may be possible to get to the top of the ladder carrying a well-developed conscience, the real hundred-percenter would hardly be so foolish as to burden himself unduly.

Another reason why we should regard with suspicion the modern outcry for "Rationalization" is the insecurity which haunts Big Business. It is a commonplace that the qualities that go to make a great master of industry, accidental or incidental, virtuous or vicious, are rare. It often happens, also, that when these men have built up a gigantic business, they may find themselves unable to control it. It becomes unwieldy or some serious defect escapes them, and it crashes. The proportion of suicides amongst such men is not insignificant. And when a vast business collapses, the full extent of its failure is not always perceptible, for it may be propped up by other businesses so as to stave off the damage done by its fall. This process is one cause of the grave difficulties in which many large-scale industries find themselves to-day. So many industrial structures are leaning against one another to prop one another up, that "Rationalization,"—that is, tying them all together and calling them one structure—may seem to be the only way of staving off a general collapse. Does anyone think that such an expedient can be more than temporary? The safest way to save a top-heavy structure standing on rotten foundations is to take it to pieces carefully, from the top downwards, and spread the pieces out on their own and firmer ground.

A further element of insecurity arises from the fact that even if the single head, or few heads, of a "Rationalized" industry, have both the genius and the other requisite qualities to sustain it, there is no guarantee that they will be succeeded by equally capable and upright men. It is not uncommon to find that, when the master-mind that has built up a big business is called to another place, there is no one equal in capacity to succeed him, and so the business fails or is absorbed by another.

As I have already implied, a strict observance of the moral code is by no means necessary for the success of Big Business. Indeed, if any success attends the stupendous State-conducted commercial efforts of the Soviets, it will be due precisely to their entire disregard for morality. This is where we, the public, come in. The power that goes with the ownership of vast enterprises is too great to be entrusted to any but

good men. How are we to guarantee that the master-minds of great "Rationalized" industries are sufficiently good to feel their moral responsibility towards the public. We cannot tell until they reach the top whether they got there by fair means or foul. Sometimes, indeed, we do not even know who is at the top.

In this connexion I would recommend to my readers half an hour's quiet meditation on the case of Ivar Kreuger, the master-mind who so effectively "Rationalized" the Swedish match industry that he was able to finance the Governments of several small European States, and thus secure profitable monopolies. These, of course, he used to "Rationalize" the match industry still further. Nobody could have had a more complete success and a more open field. Until the day he committed suicide, he was actually unknown to the multitudes, who have now learnt that his marvellous organization was based on bluff and forgery, and that the monies which they had entrusted to it were lost beyond recall. The financial repercussions of this disaster were widespread, and nearly wrecked the finances of the suicide's native country. The ultimate effect of all financial disasters on such a scale is that many trustful people are ruined, and have to start life anew. The case of Kreuger is not an isolated case—we have had our own scandals;—it is chosen here because it is typical and may still remain in the memory of my readers. It is true that his outrageous double-dealing involved an exceptional amount of money, but that was because the match industry was exceptionally "Rationalized." So remote from popular scrutiny are the operations of Big Business that there is no real security against similar disasters happening on an even larger scale in other industries. It is true that "Rationalization" would not, in theory, always involve one-man control, but in any case, there are never more than a few in supreme power.

The word power is used advisedly. The Very Big Business not only carries the possibility of vast disaster to the public at large, against which the public can make no provision, it can be used to interfere seriously with the government of the country. An industry on a very large scale, highly organized under the control of one or a few (no one at this stage is deluded by the fiction that small shareholders and bondholders exercise any sort of *effective* control), can be not only a great asset to the Government, but a great menace.

If either the politicians or the controlling industrialists are actuated by merely selfish motives, the public is apt to suffer. With the introduction of trade-control by Government, the danger becomes greater. It may very well be that the sectional interests of a particular concern—to leave questions of "graft" out of view—do not coincide with what is best for the public. Such a serious issue as peace or war, for instance, may be decided by a powerful Armament Trust, made more strong by "Rationalization."

Will anyone be bold enough to say that there is no such influence brought to bear, nowadays, on the Government of the United States, for example, or that the policies of many other States are not swayed by mighty commercial interests?

Apart from the possibility of the exercise of power indirectly against the common good, involved in the influence of Big Business on Government, the immediate exercise of that power must, almost inevitably, harm the public. One of the main features of "Rationalization" is control of price and output. If the "Rationalization" brings about agreement on prices between various parts of the industry, so ending wasteful competition, it may produce the ill-effects of a monopoly. This means that prices can be carefully and systematically raised to the maximum that the public will stand, within the operation of the economic law of diminishing returns. Any new discovery or natural cheapening of production will benefit the producers entirely, and the public not at all, for the public price will be kept to the maximum compatible with maximum consumption, and it is easy to see that maximum consumption may remain unaffected by cheapened production.

Indeed, for an industry so "rationalized" as to be able to dictate prices in this manner, it would be extremely bad business, if not a breach of trust to investors, not to make as much profit as possible. If profit can be made by cheapening production, it is no part of the industrialist's business, as a *business man*, to pass that saving on to anyone except the shareholders and controllers of the business. He is responsible to them and not to the public, and it is no part of his business to be sentimentally and gratuitously generous to the public. Big Business men are not made that way. "Service" and soapy salesmanship may be good business, sentiment and giving away something for nothing is not.

Giving away anything unnecessarily, without immediate prospect of a return, is unknown to Big Business. It cannot

afford, and therefore cannot tolerate, any weakening or sympathy towards the inefficient, unfortunate, or less successful. We are speaking, of course, of Big Business which Calvinism has divorced from ethics. So Big Business is built up by crushing out or buying up smaller businesses that are less efficient, less successful, or less temporarily in difficulties from external causes. Where these difficulties do not arise of themselves, it is the business of the efficient Captain of Industry and Master-mind of Big Business to create them, by cornering, forestalling, engrossing, regrating, undercutting, bribing employees, and the rest of the methods that were illegal in an earlier civilization, guided by Christian morality, and are no less immoral for the passage of time. In our civilization it has become a widely accepted business practice to raise new capital, by new share issues, in order to extend business by these immoral methods.

"Rationalization" continues the process on a larger scale, crushing out or buying in those sturdy and independent spirits who have been able to stand out against great odds and great wealth, the men who have all the virtues of the business men with fewer of their vices, men who are the life-blood of any industry whether its units be large or small. It is nonsense to pretend that these men succumb to bigger businesses always because they are less efficient and less fit to survive. It is equally nonsense to suppose that they are, in the main, suppressed by honest competition on principles that are not revolting to the Christian conscience. However little of the ruthless process of exterminating independence may appear in the final stages of "Rationalization" between businesses already large in scale, that ruthlessness has been essential to the earlier stages of the process, and "Rationalization" could not be attempted without it.

The nominal principle of "Efficiency First," which is the foundation of the modern theory of "Rationalization," demands that the organization of Big Business shall be as impersonal and unfeeling as possible. It is true that concessions, even apparently generous and gratuitous concessions, may be made to employees and the public to keep them content with their condition; it is true that "Rationalization" in its theoretical and ideal form may provide for a large measure of co-operation between employers and employed, even to the extent of giving the employed a voice in the business. It is also true that he who pays the piper calls the tune.

There is a strong argument made that "Rationalization," in spite of its disadvantage, its harshness, and the other unpleasant features of its development, would justify itself because it would redound so greatly to the benefit of the public in the long run by restoring prosperity. That involves a mass of sophistries too large to be dealt with here in detail. We have no guarantee that it will restore prosperity. But even granting generously that it might succeed in this, and so benefit the public, there is nothing to prove that industries composed of equally ideally developed small-scale businesses would not be equally beneficial. Prosperous business on any scale would satisfy the condition of economic good promised by prosperous "Rationalization."

To conclude. It would, indeed, be astonishing if all the master-minds of Big Business and the advocates of "Rationalization" were primarily concerned for the public welfare. Where they are so concerned we cannot be sure that they or their successors will always be so noble-minded. The trouble is that "Rationalization" gives them the control and power. They must have that control and power to direct the efficient working of the "Rationalized" industry. They may use their power for the common good or against it as they consider just, expedient, or merely advantageous to themselves. They are not directly responsible to the public. Whatever advantages may be promised, the public must, in its own defence, resist any system that gives power and control to anyone not directly responsible to it for the use of that power.

There is yet another and far more important question arising out of the concession of power to anyone who may be free to use it irresponsibly to the extent of setting expediency before justice or the common good. It is linked up with the question of tolerating any system or view of business conduct that puts efficiency before human sympathy and generosity, a system or line of conduct that cannot afford to neglect to take advantage of another's weakness or misfortune. The question affects the integrity of the primary Christian virtue and commandment of Charity. The Christian, unless he holds that a man may divest himself of the cloak of religion during business hours in order to work more freely, will find himself under the necessity of answering the question.

G. C. HESELTINE.

CARDINAL ALLEN AND THE SOCIETY

I

1561—1580: TO THE DEATH OF MERCURIAN

THE fourth centenary of the birth of Cardinal Allen has already been worthily commemorated, both by the celebrations at St. Edmund's College and by various articles that have appeared in the Catholic Press. These have rightly laid emphasis on Allen's part in the foundation of Douay, the mother of many daughter seminaries, which one and all, by their martyrs, confessors, and courageous missionary priests played a noble part, albeit subordinate to Douay, in keeping alive the Faith in England amid severe persecution and transmitting it to our own days. The foundation of Douay and its perpetuation in the face of immense difficulties was, undoubtedly, Allen's greatest achievements. The Cardinal, however, was a man of varied parts and of many-sided activity; and one phase of his work certainly merits to be discussed in greater detail and with greater emphasis than it has yet received:—the defence of the Faith and of its heroic martyrs and priests, to be found in his own writings. Books, as he himself declared, prepared the way for the zealous missionaries, and in that preparatory labour, his own writings played no inconsiderable part. Doubtless, when the work on the Louvain School of Apologists, projected by Father Guilday but unfortunately left unaccomplished, is again taken up by Catholic scholars,—Father Guilday, we are given to understand, has himself definitely abandoned the idea,—Allen's achievement in this sphere will receive its due meed of praise. A young Catholic student, indeed, might well take it as a subject for a thesis. Opportunity, also, might have been taken, in this fourth centenary, to place Allen's political thought and activity in its proper perspective and to defend it, as in the main it can and should be defended on the lines laid down by Knox, but supplemented by Mr. Hollis.¹ Here again lies work to hand for the Catholic student. For the present, however, we must content

¹ Knox, "Allen," Introduction; Hollis "The Monstrous Regiment."

ourselves with simply indicating these fields of research and confine ourselves in these articles to illustrating an aspect of Allen's life, which, also, though materials for it are for the most part already in print, has not as yet received adequate treatment; namely, his relations with the Society of Jesus.

In 1561 Allen, having resigned his preferments in England, left the country and took up his residence at Louvain, where many of the English exiles, driven forth like himself, by the change of religion and by the penal legislation enforcing it, had already settled. In that same town, nearly twenty years earlier, a small band of Jesuits expelled from France at the outbreak of war between Charles V. and Francis I. had sought for the time being a refuge. Their temporary residence had, since then, developed into a permanent settlement; and their ministry, though limited in scope by the refusal of the town authorities to grant them full recognition, had met with striking success. It was through the Jesuits at Louvain that Allen first became intimately acquainted with the Society; and the sympathy shown to the English exiles and the aid rendered to them by the Fathers under their Provincial, Everard Mercurian, made a deep and lasting impression upon him. Years later, he recalled those services in a letter to Mercurian, then General of the Society.

Although [he writes] it is a long time since I wrote to you, I have never ceased lovingly to commend you and your beloved flock to our common Lord. For though to all, in these days of prolonged exile and continued disaster we have been made debtors through Christ, yet to your holy Society are we beholden for services more long-standing, more acceptable and more helpful than those of all others combined. If you do not virtuously assign to oblivion,—as I well believe you do,—the good done to others by you and yours, you may recall, as I do, indeed with pleasure, how while you were staying in Belgium, you welcomed the English exiles. Many were saved from that catastrophe [the wreck of the Church in England], many were received into your Order or reconciled to our Mother the Church by the zealous labours of your brethren. How many, too, in the succeeding years, first at Louvain, then at Douay, and finally at Rome itself were led to persevere, chiefly owing to your counsel, your

charity, your encouragement and influence. It is to you, therefore, after God and our most holy Father, Gregory, and his counsellors, that our country, if it is ever to be ours again, owes first thanks that some little seed of the Lord's field still remains.¹

It was in Belgium, too, that Allen first gained personal knowledge of the colleges of the Society and of its system of education, which he so highly valued and later introduced so far as possible into his own foundation at Douay. The above-quoted letter to Mercurian was, indeed, occasioned by the General's assigning to the English College, recently established at Rome, two members of the Society, one to be spiritual Father to the students, the other to superintend their studies.²

The most recent of your many services [the letter continues] includes in itself all the previous ones: it is that for the education of our students there, you have allowed us to have from your Society, already fully occupied with various works of charity, men eminently suited for the purpose. My friend, Gregory Martin, on his recent return, was happy to tell me about it, Archdeacon Lewis in a letter from Rome enlarged upon it with delight, and those whom it most concerns [the students themselves] often write to me about it; so that I who have nothing in the world dearer to me than the welfare and holy training of those young men, could not hide the deep joy of my heart at the kindness of your most reverend Paternity towards them. Indeed, Father, as far as our secular state allows, I have always striven that our students should be trained by no other studies, and by no other discipline and customs than those of your Society; for there are none to-day more suited for the acquisition of knowledge, more conducive to inspire sincere piety, or, what is most needed in these days, more adapted to foster zeal for souls. And our English students themselves, by a certain attraction of soul,—a God-inspired attraction, as I interpret it,—have everywhere been glad to

¹ Allen to Mercurian, October 26, 1578. Sacchinus ("Historia Societatis Jesu," pars. 4a, lib. 7, pp. 208 ff.), gives the letter in full. Knox ("Allen," p. 68), reprints a shortened form of it from Tierney (II, ccclxxiii). Cf. also Bartoli, "Inghilterra," (1647), p. 40. In 1562 the exiles at Louvain sent a petition to the General, urging him to request that some part of the Papal alms might be diverted to them. "Archives S.J." Gall. Epp. ad. Gen. 1.

² Fathers Giovanni Novarola and Ferdinando Capecci.

frequent your schools and to imitate your spirit. The proximity of your colleges to ours has furnished opportunity for this, though we have not been able to carry it into effect to the extent of our desires, but only so far as our resources allowed.¹ Now, however, that God, through his Holiness the Pope, has granted us the favour of a college in the chief place of the Church and of the world, and you in your piety have allowed it to be staffed and directed by prudent and devoted Fathers of your order, truly all things have been given to me and to those who are mine in Christ.

Begging the General, then, to continue his good offices and to commend both colleges to the Holy Father, he in his own name and that of the whole nation makes an appeal to him, that, as Jesuits are labouring in the farthest Indies for the salvation of souls, they may also take their place on the missionary field of England, where the need is not less.

To this letter Mercurian replied early in the following year.²

All your Reverence's tender love and boundless zeal for religion [he writes] were in every way manifest in the letter which I lately received from your hand. For in that you display so much solicitude for the salvation of your own people, and so greatly extoll our labours on their behalf, we gladly recognize that all this springs from your charity and desire for God's glory. And we, although we see clearly that our strength is but small, nay is weakness itself, and is altogether unequal to what our position calls for, yet in desire and in will we proclaim ourselves to be so keen to help all men and especially your country of England, that we greatly yearn for some occasion to be given us of labouring for that sorely tried kingdom; nor are we without hopes that God will at some time afford us this opportunity. Assuredly, in the meantime, we will not cease, by the only way we can, namely, by our prayers and Masses and those of our subjects, from commending this intention to our Lord God.

Shortly after the date of Mercurian's letter, in consequence

¹ A like testimony as regards Allen's wishes was given by the students at Rome in 1578, "C.R.S.", ix., pp. 116, 75. Cf. also Allen to Como, September 12, 1583, Knox, "Allen," p. 212. Allen to Agazzari, January 15, 1582, "C.R.S.", ix., p. 41.

² Mercurian to Allen, January 5, 1579, "C.R.S.", ix., p. 69.

of the strife between the English students and the Welsh, and the refusal of the former to continue under the rule of Maurice Clenock, the Pope commanded the General to undertake the entire administration of the Seminary at Rome. With the previous expression before us of his regard for the Society and of his esteem for its educational methods, it can cause no surprise that Allen unfeignedly welcomed the step, though he disapproved, as did Persons, of the methods by which the English students had obtained what they desired.¹ In a letter to Owen Lewis who was thought to have resisted the students' wishes and to have championed the cause of his Welsh compatriot, Allen wrote on this occasion:

The news of ending all and the Jesuits establishing came unto us both by your letter and divers others, which I assure you made us a double Easter. . . . The broil was so perilous, and I saw the students everyone so bent that they would have lost all rather than have been under one of that nation [the Welsh]; yea and forsake whom and what else soever. Not doubting of your wisdom, that both you and his Holiness would rather condescend to their infirmity rather than by this sinister accident or by their expulsion undo that work so happily begun, yea and our whole country and yours. Specially seeing they might be appeased with so honest a thing as to have the Fathers for their governors: which their request, to make you understand our whole mind, seemed to all our nation most lawful and Godly; though their manner of proceeding and unkind alienation from you that hath done and daily do endeavour so much good for this seminary and that and all our country together. . . . This disorder and hazard of all in them was exceedingly misliked of all the wise and myself here; though the committing the house to the Society was all our desires. And right sorry we were of that error that Mr. Maurice was made rector, and gladly would have had, if the Jesuits might not nor would not have been, rather Dr. Bristow.²

On Father Alphonsus Agazzari's appointment as the first Jesuit Rector of the College, his joy again found expression in a letter typical of his great charity and zeal.

For the restoration [he writes] of peace to that College

¹ Cf. Persons to Allen, March 30, 1579, "C.R.S.", ix., p. 135; Persons to William Good, *ibid.*, p. 159.

² Allen to Owen Lewis, May 12, 1579, Knox, "Allen," p. 79.

as much your College as ours, after such boisterous storms, we have long ere this by prayer and sacrifice given to the Lord our God thanks as great as our heart—wonderfully enlarged by this divine favour—could embrace and conceive. But in that the future fortunes of that child of my heart have fallen to your holy Society and more especially into your hands, most Reverend Father Alphonsus, how great is my joy, how great my hopes, how deep a gratitude I owe to Christ, to the Pope, to your Father General, to your Order, and to your own person, I will not attempt to express in words; but in my soul, which is much more responsive to such good fortune than a mere reed-pen, I augur all happiness for myself, for my friends, and for our commonwealth.

And this joy I share not only with my comrades and fellow-exiles here [in the Low Countries] and there at Rome but also with all English Catholics, who everywhere throughout our island are with good reason exultant at this boon from heaven; a joy which I hope no one will filch from us, for it is of good weight, well-tried, refined and minted out of sorrow, both yours and mine.

But as to yourself, O Reverend Father, or—in that you have come to share our labours, to the great happiness of me and mine,—O most sweet Colleague and Comrade in Christ,—a title to me more pleasing by far—it is my conviction that the privilege of being the first Rector of that College, which is the hope of all our race, has been granted and invested in you by God Himself, on the score of your eminent charity; for in truth you love us more than all the rest. For in your illustrious Order, too, all aglow though it be with charity and zeal (just as in the Apostolic College and among the fellowship of the Saints), there are still degrees of love; and so no one was to rule over ours, set apart for the loftiest enterprise of charity, unless he were in a swoon with love of the souls that perish. And while I rejoice that you are of such a character, as well as Fathers Ferdinand, Paul and the other most reverend men who are our fellow-labourers in the Lord; yet I cannot but oft-times feel a secret shame, that I do not so love—much though I may esteem them—my brothers according to the flesh and disciples by every title most dear, as you all love them, men to you unknown, in wretchedness and exile. . .

At present I am absent from my charge: for I have come to Douay at the invitation of the magistrates, who desire the return of our College among them, deploring its expulsion as a wrong. This is also my desire, both on account of other advantages, and especially because your Society has here a College, a boon we lack at Rheims. On this matter I have likewise written to the Cardinal of Como and to others. Would that the affairs of the two Colleges could be so arranged and co-ordinated that all the business of our one here could be handled by no one else than by you, who look after the English College there in Rome. So should we be freed from many troubles and not be forced to employ the services of others; on whom we must needs rely till such time as the working-systems of both Colleges become a completed whole.¹

No sooner were the affairs of the College settled, than there was a general desire for Allen to come to Rome, to co-ordinate the working of the two Seminaries. Already in March, Persons urged him to take the step.

To show you here [he wrote] the commodities and utilities which may ensue of your journey, it shall be to small purpose, for your wisdom will far better conceive it than we, yet these points have we proposed here to move his Holiness and other Superiors to consent and desire your coming; first the pacifying of grudges between the two nations, seeing Mr. D. Lewis is your great friend; then the uniting and combining of this College to yours there in all good correspondence, and these two were sufficient for his Holiness: but further to ourselves we have proposed the confirmation and increase of that Seminaries' pension by his Holiness: the right informing also of F. General of the Society in our English affairs, where perhaps you may induce him to join some of his also (seeing God hath sent so many now of our nation into the Society) with our other Priests to go into England, seeing otherwise you and others have written that it is much desired by Catholics there, and here, I am sure, there wanteth not desire in divers to adventure their

¹ Allen to Agazzari, June 28, 1579, "C.R.S.", ix., p. 15. Allen also wrote to Mercurian thanking him for undertaking the care of the College. The letter is not now extant. Mercurian's reply, June 3, 1579, is to be found in "C.R.S.", ix., p. 71.

blood in that mission, among whom I dare put myself for one if Holy Obedience employ me therein.¹

Allen, however, though anxious himself to proceed to Rome and pressed thereto by his colleagues at Rheims, still held back, fearing that by his coming he might offend the Pope and Cardinal Como; for "my care of remaining here," he writes, "comes of my superiors."² No one, perhaps, more realized the need of Allen's wise counsel than the new Rector of the College, Alphonsus Agazzari; and doubting whether affairs at the moment could be effectively discussed with him by correspondence, he, at the instance of Father Persons and other English residents at Rome, laid the whole matter before the Pope. On June 13th he reported to Allen that His Holiness desired his presence in Rome for a few months, provided he had at Rheims those capable of looking after the seminary there during his absence.³ Whether this intimation was sufficient, or an official letter was sent by Como summoning him to Rome, is uncertain. At all events, committing the care of the seminary at Rheims to Dr. Bristow, he set out on August 27th and on October 10th arrived at Rome.⁴

There, he quickly settled most of the points that Persons had mentioned in his letter of March. "He made a perfect union and correspondence," writes the same author, "between the two seminaries, how scholars should pass from the one to the other; who should be sent into England and the like: he procured also the increase of fifty crowns the month to the College of Rheims from Pope Gregory, more than it had before, by the help of the Fathers of the Society, with sundry indulgences and benedictions, with which he returned to Rheims with much comfort. But his special consolation was that he had obtained of Pope Gregory that some of the English Fathers of the said Society should for time to come be sent into England together with the priests of the Seminaries."⁵ Already in the previous year, this had been Allen's

¹ Persons to Allen, March 30, 1579, "C.R.S.", ii., p. 136. (Spelling modernized.)

² Allen to Owen Lewis, May 12, 1579, *ut supra*. Cf. Allen to Agazzari, June 28, 1579, *ut supra*.

³ Agazzari to Allen, June 13, 1579, "C.R.S.", ii., p. 139. Cf. "Domestical Difficulties," *ibid.* pp. 100, 135. In "The Entrance of the Jesuits into England," Persons states that he procured for Allen a grant from the Pope to help towards the expenses of the journey. *Ibid.*, p. 194.

⁴ Knox, "Douay Diaries," p. 155. "Domestical Difficulties," "C.R.S.", ii., p. 137.

⁵ "The Entrance of the Jesuits into England," "C.R.S.", ii., p. 194.

earnest petition to Mercurian. Now that he was in Rome he strongly urged the matter, both with the Pope and the General, and after long debate he gained his request; Persons, Campion, and Brother Ralph Emerson being the first of the Society chosen for the mission.¹ It was through Allen, indeed, that the Jesuits came to England. His satisfaction at the decision of the authorities is clearly expressed in an exultant letter announcing the result to his former friend of Douay.

My father, brother, son Edmund Campion [he writes], for to you I must use every expression of the tenderest ties of love,—since the General of your Order, who to you is Christ Himself, calls you from Prague to Rome and thence to our own England; since your brethren according to the flesh call upon you (for though you hear not their words, God has heard their prayers),—I who am so closely connected with them, with you and with our common country both in the world and in the Lord, must not be the only one to keep silence, when I should be first to desire you, to call you, to cry to you. Make all haste and come, my dearest Campion; you have done enough at Prague towards remedying the evils that our countrymen inflicted upon Bohemia. It will be dutiful, religious, and Christian in you to devote the rest of your life and some part of your extraordinary gifts to our beloved country, which has the greatest need of your labours in Christ. I do not stay to inquire what your own wish and inclination may be, since it is your happiness to live, not by your own will, but by others'; and you would not shrink from the greatest perils or the farthest Indies if your superiors bade you go. Our harvest is already great in England: ordinary labourers are not enough; more practised men are wanted, but chiefly you and others of your order. The General has yielded to all our prayers; the Pope, the true father of our country, has consented; and God, in whose hands are the issues, has at last granted that our own Campion, with his extraordinary gifts of wisdom and grace, should be restored to us. Prepare yourself then for a journey, for a work, for a trial. You will have an excellent colleague, and

¹ Allen to Mercurian, October 26, 1578, Sacchinus, *op. cit.*, p. 209. If the letter to Mercurian, 1575—6, printed in "C.R.S.", ix., p. 63, was written, as seems probable, by Allen, he suggested the Jesuit mission even earlier.

though they still live who sought the Child's life, yet for some time past a door has been open for you in the Lord. It is not that I am preparing for you and your order the place in England that your soul presages, but it is you, I hope, who will procure for me and mine the power of returning.¹

Thanks to the decision to associate Jesuit Fathers with the missionary priests in England, Allen and Persons were able to assuage a stir among the students at Rome, which otherwise might have developed into another sedition. The trouble arose from two of the students declaring their desire to join the Society. There ensued, in consequence, a rivalry and contention among them as to which of the two vocations was preferable, that of going into England or that of entering Religion abroad and leaving the harvest at home. Allen himself considered the entrance of the students into the Society inopportune at the very inception of the seminary, owing to the disturbance it caused, and endeavoured, though in vain, to dissuade the two candidates. Nor was their proposal welcome either to the Pope or to the Jesuit Superiors. The two, however, eventually gained their desire, and the commotion was allayed by the decision to send Jesuits to England, which made it impossible to consider entrance to the Society an escape from the toils and perils of missionary life in England. But in view of the excitement aroused, the Pope himself, Allen and the Jesuit Superiors agreed that for the future it should be allowed only very rarely, for a grave cause and not without the express consent of the Cardinal Protector and His Holiness.²

Soon after this question had been settled, Allen set out on his return journey to Rheims. From Siena he sent a hurried note to Agazzari.

Your brother [he wrote] is not in the city, or I should have embraced him as one who is to me as my own brother in the flesh; for in such a way, for very good

¹ Allen to Campion, December 5, 1579. Stonyhurst, Anglia, I., No. 7. Knox, "Allen," p. 84. Translation in Simpson, "Campion," 1867, p. 95.

² Allen to Barrett, August 1 and 9, 1580, Knox, "Allen," pp. 150, 151. *Informatio de Seminario Anglicano Romæ* [circa 1580], "Archives, S.J.," Hist. Coll. Angl. Hib. Scot., ff. 3, 3v. Persons's "Domestical Difficulties," "C.R.S.," ii., p. 101. Ely, "Brief Notes," p. 75. Ely, however, is incorrect in stating that "Persons procured Allen's coming to Rome," on account of this dissension: cf. Persons to Allen, March 30, Agazzari to Allen, June 13, 1579, *ut supra*. I hope, in a future article, to illustrate from contemporary documents the whole question of vocations to the Society and Allen's attitude in the matter.

reasons, my Father, am I thine; that there is no one that is bound to your Reverence by ties either of nature or of grace, who is not in the same measure my beloved friend: and of this love you have there a pledge, to wit that College, than which there is nothing on earth that is more dear to both of us or more suited to bring us into eternal union in Heaven. I would have you salute all her children and bid them be ever mindful of me. Their names, in the brief space of time afforded me for writing, would not come within the compass of this sheet; but all of them one by one, from the youngest even to the eldest, I hold engraven in my heart. As for all the Fathers,—who under you in that house are labouring for my children's salvation and who have already rendered me, a most unworthy wretch, so many charitable services,—there is no need for me to enumerate them: on earth, and as I hope in heaven, I will bear them ever in mind.

May I burden you with this commission only, to give, in my name a special salutation to very Reverend Father General and to Father Oliver (Manare) with that affection which is suitable and you know I desire. In which kind, lest I offend in any way against Father Persons, that most dear friend of my heart, I desire this letter about our journey to be as much his as yours.¹

Arrived at Rheims, he again wrote to Agazzari, eagerly asking news of how the students were progressing and whether Persons and Campion had already set out from Rome.

Salute I beg you with a holy embrace [the letter continues] all ours—your sons and mine—and your fellow-labourers in their training and instruction; everyone, not only those in authority in the house, but also the university professors, whom I cherish much in Christ. As to Father General, whose devoted son I would be for ever, and Father Oliver and Father Provincial [Claudius Aquaviva] by no words can I do myself justice. If your own language better conveys the feelings of one replete with love and devotion towards them, then strive all you can, dear Father Alphonsus, to unfold all my love and affection in their regard; . . . and I desire also to tender religious

¹ Allen to Agazzari, February 29, 1580, "C.R.S.", ix., p. 21. Oliver Manare was Assistant to the General.

salutations to that pair of novices, sons engendered by our sorrows.¹

On May 2nd, the Jesuit missionaries of whom he had been eager to have news arrived at Rheims. The cordial welcome given to them, on that occasion, was recalled years later by Persons. "It can scarce be expressed," he wrote, "with how great joy and tender love we were received by all those confessors and servants of God that lived there and especially Father Campion was exceeding welcome both to Mr. Dr. Allen the President, and to all the rest for that he had been one of them before in Douay . . . so that there was no end of their embracing and welcoming the good man."²

Before the end of June both missionaries had crossed to England. But Mercurian, who had co-operated with Allen in sending them, did not live to hear of their successful labours. He died on August 1st. In him Allen lost a great friend and zealous collaborator for the preservation of the Faith in England. His letter, on the receipt of the news of his death, is not now extant, but its tenor may be gathered from Manare's reply to Allen.

Your Reverence [he wrote] could not have manifested more clearly or more explicitly your affection and at the same time that wide-reaching charity of yours towards us all than by the expression of grief with which you have learned of our most excellent Father's departure from this life; so that even we ourselves, to whom that blow came nearer home, could scarce have shown more heartfelt sorrow: assuredly your Reverence would seem to have heard of and grieved over that misfortune just like one of Ours. And yet—since such has been the will of God, "to Whom we all live and to Whom we all die,"—those thoughts which your Reverence tried to express in writing are a consolation to us also, and especially the hope you suggested that he from heaven will not cease to help us and our interests with his prayers.³

In Mercurian's successor, however, Claudius Aquaviva, Allen was to find a collaborator no less zealous than his departed friend.

LEO HICKS.

¹ Allen to Agazzari, April 9, 1580, "C.R.S.", ix., p. 23.

² Persons's "Life and Martyrdom of Father Edmund Campion," 1594, c. 17, Stonyhurst Coll., p. 114.

³ Oliver Manare to Allen, October 27, 1580, "C.R.S.", ix, p. 73.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

THE SURVIVAL OF SLAVERY.

ONCE the equality of all the human race, the members of which, differing in every possible way as regards their bodies, owe, one and all, their souls to the immediate creation of God, was revealed and kept before the eyes of the world by Christianity, the institution known as chattel-slavery was seen to be in essence an unjust violation of God's ownership of His creatures and a denial of their common destiny, and so received a mortal wound. Yet, we must admit, it has taken an unconscionably long time in dying. Not one, now, amongst those influenced by Christian civilization ventures to defend it theoretically, but in nations where the Christian culture has not struck root—in large parts of Asia and Africa,—it is still widely practised. And even Christianity, although constantly fighting against the evils with which it was always associated—denial of personal rights, moral degradation, cruelty, irreligion—was long tolerant of the thing itself, as not essentially wrong, and capable, therefore, of being reconciled with the natural law. That all a man's labour—and this alone would constitute slavery—should be perpetually at the disposal of another man might be a penalty for crime. We still sentence delinquents to servitude for life. And, since a man may lawfully sell his labour to another for a period, so he may sell it for his life-time. These theoretical considerations, no doubt, prevented that downright denunciation of slavery *per se* which we might otherwise have expected from Christian moralists; just as the possibility of fighting being just prevents them to-day from declaring war to be intrinsically evil and thus makes the task of ending it less difficult. But the persistence of serfdom for long centuries,¹ the later recrudescence of slavery in Mediterranean countries as a result of warfare against the non-Christian races, and its further growth in the Colonies of the New World, when, with the destruction of the unity of Christendom, the Church's moral influence was weakened and circumscribed,—all show how naturally man's lust for power and gain finds expression in this crime against human dignity and freedom.

Next year will be celebrated the first centenary of the Act declaring the manumission of all the negro slaves in the British

¹ Slavery was not wholly banished from Christendom till towards the end of the fifteenth century, at which period there still remained a narrow range of serfdom.

dominions; an Act which cost the British taxpayer some twenty million pounds, to be paid as compensation to the former slave-owners, and which, in the words of Lecky, "may probably be regarded as among the three or four perfectly virtuous acts recorded in the history of nations." The Act is always and rightly associated with the name of William Wilberforce, who devoted his life to the cause of Abolition, but he had many fellow-labourers and not a few predecessors, especially amongst the Quakers. Without detracting in any way from the Christian and humanitarian zeal of those who fought this entrenched iniquity, in and out of Parliament, we may note how in the very same men it was found compatible with complete insensibility to the industrial slavery which was prevalent in England for the first half of last century. Wilberforce, Clarkson and other "philanthropists," so righteously indignant with the traffic in negroes, were actually hostile to the various efforts made to alleviate the terrible lot of the "free" victims of the British Factory System. The *Jellaby* type was no invention of Charles Dickens.

It took a long time and, in the United States, a Civil War, to abolish slavery amongst other civilized nations, and, as we have said, it still prevails in many parts of the world. But efforts to suppress it are growing in strength and it is felt that the approaching celebration of the centenary of the British Negro Emancipation Act provides a suitable occasion for arousing the public opinion of the world against the continued existence of this blot on humanity. From information collected by the League of Nations, in its Slavery Commission of 1922, which has done much to foster and co-ordinate the movement, it appeared that slavery continues in seventeen political areas including some under British control. Lady Simon's recent book, "Slavery" (1929), not only describes the horrors of the slave-trade as it still persists, but estimates the number of slaves in the world as between four and six millions. Abyssinia alone contains two millions, but, happily, their ultimate emancipation has already been decreed by the present enlightened ruler of the country who hopes to accomplish it within ten or fifteen years. Catholics need not be reminded of the great work accomplished in Northern Africa by Cardinal Lavigerie and his White Fathers who were commissioned by Leo XIII. in 1888 to conduct a crusade against slavery in those regions. As for the rest the League of Nations, which is bound by a clause in the Covenant to put down slavery "in all its forms," resolved in 1928 to attempt "world abolition," and forthwith Great Britain secured the freedom of 215,000 "domestic slaves" in the Protectorate of Sierra Leone and 180,000 in Tanganyika.

The modern reason for the continuance of slavery is the desire for cheap labour in tropical countries,—a desire which

the whites who seek their livelihood in such countries are naturally prone to conceive. Hence the constant necessity of supervision of "colonial" labour conditions, where something akin to slavery, viz., "forced labour," is apt to be practised. The League of Nations holds an International Labour Conference every year wherein this question is constantly recurring. The difficulty of reconciling the exigencies of trade with the claims of humanity, or rather with the moral law, in a discussion between nations of various levels of ethical culture, was well described by Mr. J. Eppstein in an article in these pages (July, 1930) on "'Forced Labour' in Colonial Territories"—the subject before the Labour Conference of that year. Yet it is obvious that concerted action is necessary for the universal vindication of the rights of the "backward" peoples, and we may welcome the more gladly the assurance, conveyed in the late Report (September 22nd) of the League, that complete abolition of slavery is well in hand.

J.K.

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

The German Claim to Equality in Arms.

President Hoover tried in vain to persuade the Disarmament Conference to exchange discussion for action by his proposal last June that every nation should start forthwith to reduce its armaments by one-third. The Conference hesitated and was lost. Now the inevitable has happened. Anyone whose judgment was not blinded by nationalistic prepossessions could have foretold that the patience of the German people would break down and that no Government could hope to remain in power there, which did not make very clear that the time had come for the thorough implementing of the disarmament clauses of the Versailles Treaty, and that, unless that were done, Germany would not hold herself bound by the terms of that Treaty to unilateral disarmament. The plain sense of the Treaty was that all the Powers should proceed to disarm, after the model of Germany, if not to the same extent. Now, thirteen years after that agreement, seven years after the Locarno Pact, six years after the admission of Germany as an equal into the League, there is no sign that the victorious nations have any idea of making Germany's international position less invidious by reducing their armed forces to a degree fairly comparable to hers, especially by abandoning the type and size of weapon forbidden to her as essentially "aggressive." Her protest cannot be said to be precipitate. Stresemann, most conciliatory of her statesmen, expressed the grievance long ago. Bruening, always very reasonable, called attention to it before the Junkers drove him from office. Von Papen, thought to be militaristic, has openly declared—"Germany

has no desire nor intention to arm, but she demands that other nations shall keep their promises to disarm." She only asks for that reconsideration, by the League of Nations, of the punitive clauses of the Treaty, which the Treaty itself allows her. It has come to this that, owing to the futilities of the "first phase" of the Disarmament Conference, Germany is able, with some show of justice, to accuse the Allies of having themselves already violated Versailles. And, if she chooses to act according to her warning—"Either you disarm or I shall re-arm"—who is to prevent her?

**The Real
Obstacle to
Disarmament.**

It seems almost incredible, but it is the fact that a great paper, *The Times*,¹ rather than urge the former alternative, is actually disposed to give Germany a formal authorization to re-arm—to a certain extent! If she were allowed a small number of those offensive weapons at present denied her,—so runs the strange logic—and the other nations promised ultimately to approximate more closely to her level, she might be content! From the point of view of European peace, the proposition spells sheer lunacy, but to the war-trader's mind it is so calculated to bring renewed hope that it may well have come from that mind originally. Behind and above these prolonged and largely futile discussions about disarmament, there is to be seen, in the Press and in the market, a spirit definitely hostile to any diminution of that vast and widespread traffic in munitions through which a few make fortunes and multitudes find their livelihood. Every new war means new orders. From the United States, during the past year, as asserted in the House of Representatives, £36,000,000 worth of munitions have been provided to Japan by American firms, the while political America was warning Japan that the fruits of her aggression would not be recognized! The United States, indeed, consider the power to export arms to one Government and refuse them to another to be a valuable means of exercising their influence in New World politics. These are facts, not the surmises of a lively imagination. Shortly after the War, in September, 1921, a League of Nations Committee appointed to investigate the facts of private arms-manufacture reported that armament firms—

(1) have been active in fomenting war-scares and in persuading their own combines to adopt war-like policies and increase their armaments;

(2) have attempted to bribe Government officials both at home and abroad;

(3) have disseminated false reports concerning the military and naval programmes of various countries in order to stimulate armament-expenditure;

¹ Issues of September 5th, 10th, and 19th.

(4) have sought to influence public opinion through the control of newspapers in their own and foreign countries;

(5) have organized international armament rings through which the "armaments race" has been accentuated by playing off one country against another;

(6) have organized international armaments trusts which have increased the price of armaments to Governments.

The League Commissioners, indeed, might have condensed their report to a single line—"Armaments firms have acted according to the traditional morality of Big Business." Much evidence of the truth of these very grave charges has been forthcoming during the intervening years.

**Futile
Attempts to
Regulate
Arms-Traffic.**

Time and again the League, to which was entrusted the general supervision of this dangerous commerce, has tried to check and regulate it, but the financial "pull" which the Trusts exercise over the various "producing" States, some dozen in number, has always prevented the establishment of effective control. In addition to several national arsenals, there are about fifty private firms in different countries which manufacture war munitions, many of them under the same ultimate control. The Vickers-Armstrong Combine, for instance, includes four English concerns, three Italian, one Spanish and one Japanese, and even "munition repair-shops" in China. These private firms exist and flourish because, so long as war is a possibility, preparations for war must go on in peace time, because, moreover, stocks must be renewed, new inventions made use of, plant kept at the highest pitch of efficiency, workers trained and kept in training, and finally because not only is there a demand from non-producing nations, but even those which possess Government arsenals, find private firms more efficient and, in some ways, more economical. But the vested interests involved have become so enormous, so many in high positions in the State are financially concerned in the maintenance and growth of munition-making, the Press is so largely influenced by the firms themselves, that the League, although keeping steadily at work, has not yet devised any means of meeting the evils which its Commission diagnosed so frankly. It framed the China Arms Embargo in May 1919 whereby seven manufacturing States, not including Germany, Czechoslovakia and Russia, agreed not to sell arms to China until that Republic had a stable and responsible Government. But the embargo did not mention military aeroplanes, nor machinery for making arms, nor was it found possible to prevent smuggling, nor would Germany and Russia accept the Embargo till 1928, so that arms-imports into that distracted country—the victim of the rivalries of various War-Lords—increased thirty-fold in five years.

**The
War-Traders
Triumph.**

Another attempt to prevent free-trade in this most ruinous kind of merchandise was made, also in 1919, by the Convention of St. Germain, whereby twenty-three States agreed that arms should not be exported except to the recognized Government of another State. This never came into force, because the United States refused to ratify it, claiming the right, which it has repeatedly exercised, of supplying arms to revolutionaries. We do not think that Americans, who boast, with some justice, that their country takes the lead amongst the world's peace-makers, realize what an obstacle to the suppression of war is created by its unwillingness to control this very lucrative but disastrous form of business, for the success of which the continuance of war is necessary, nor how ill such procedure accords with the Kellogg Pact. A country which has renounced war as an instrument of international policy so emphatically, should at least not encourage others to use such an instrument. Later on, in the League Arms Traffic Convention of 1925, which America helped to draft, a third effort was made to bring the arms-trade into the open and thus secure, at least, the check of public opinion. The signatory States—forty-four were members—agreed to publish quarterly a statistical return of their foreign trade in the various categories of war material and only to sell to Governments or to subordinate public bodies authorized by them. They also passed a Protocol absolutely forbidding the use of poison-gas and bacteria in war. The first part of this Convention, though ratified by the Great Powers, including the United States, still lacks the full number of ratifications—fourteen—necessary for its coming into force. Thirteen have ratified, but Britain and France only on condition that the nine other manufacturing States should do likewise. So another plan is indefinitely hung up. As for the Poison-gas Protocol, thirty-three ratifications have put it into force, but several, including this country, undertake to observe it only if poison is not used against them: a proviso which leaves them free to go on seeking to perfect its deadlines. Britain spent £116,300 last year on this research alone. And, according to Mr. Wells,¹ scientists in the United States, after many failures, have succeeded in breeding types of virulent disease-germs strong enough to survive dissemination through the air and capable of infecting whole populations. If war once starts, excuse will surely be found for using them.

International Unrest It will be seen that something more than political agreements is needed to free mankind from the incubus of war. The will for peace is fostered by the Armament-Trade. The will for peace is recognized as essential, if any pacts are to be really binding. *The Times*, trying to account for the delay in disarmament.

¹ "Work, Wealth and Happiness of Mankind," p. 612.

ment, in spite of the world's desire of it and the pressing economic reasons for it, ascribes it to a general feeling of insecurity. But though its remarks are purposely vague, they would seem to apply only to France and her "allies." On September 10th it wrote:

The course of the Disarmament Conference has shown beyond any possibility of doubt that certain countries are definitely unwilling at the present moment to make really drastic cuts in their armed strengths. They have every temptation to make them. They are for the most part in great financial difficulties. They have solemnly renounced war as an instrument of policy. They are members of the League of Nations, and pledged to each other's defence against unlawful aggression. Yet they feel absolutely unable to renounce the protection which they feel their own arms alone sufficiently provide. This refusal to follow the line of economy and of reason cannot be ascribed to a mere whim or to some vague political frenzy.

No, it can only be ascribed to fear of becoming too weak to maintain rights, and that fear, prompting to the piling up of armaments, is kept alive largely through the influence of those hidden international interests which have everything to lose by the universal establishment of peace. *The Times* does not mention those interests. It is content to point to a subsidiary cause.

The sense of insecurity in Europe is in no small measure due to the activities of wide sections of the German people, who openly boast of their military instincts, and to the defiant speeches of one of the leading members of the Nationalist Government which is putting forward the claim to equality.

But it does not point out that this resurgence of militarism in Germany—the rise of Hitlerism, the parade of the ex-Servicemen, the establishment of a universal quasi-military gymnastic organization, the laying down, when still in the throes of financial distress, of a new "pocket battleship"—is itself due to the former Allies showing themselves disloyal to the League, by seeming not to take the matter of disarmament really seriously. It is a vicious circle, perhaps, but the Arms International will not readily see it broken.

**No Possible
Alternative
to Disarmament.**

Nevertheless, we see no reason to despair of disarmament. Each succeeding check makes clearer that the reverse process means destruction. The recent interchange of Notes between Germany and France indicated that both countries were wholly averse to a renewed race of armaments, and—since reduction is the only possible alternative—the will to reduce is evidently there. Both Notes, unlike the Press-comments on them, are conciliatory in tone. Germany, on August 29th, said she had hoped

that, by means of the Conference, "the other States should disarm to an armament level which, in consideration of the special conditions of each country, corresponded in its manner and extent to the armament level laid on Germany by the Versailles Treaty." But her hopes had been falsified by the final resolution of the Conference on July 23rd, which ended with a mere programme, and that taking no account at all of Germany's armament status. And yet, in the matter of radical disarmament "there are no provisions which Germany would reject on account of the scope of the obligation contained in them, provided that the general regime created by the Convention held good for all States." This is a clear echo of Signor Mussolini's offer to cut down Italian forces to any level, however low, provided it were universal. The French reply published on September 12th, was also friendly, and protested a sincere desire for reduction of armaments, manifested by a considerable lessening of military expenditure in France and proposals, such as that suggesting the entire abolition of war-planes, which her Government had made. But it opposed the idea that Conference decisions could, *ipso facto*, abrogate the enactments of the Versailles Treaty. That could only be done by the League itself. "When, in the spirit of the Covenant, and following its provisions, an international organization is created, which assures security to, and imposes identical obligations on, all," then the German claim for equality of status will be practically recognized. Meanwhile, that claim, as voiced by responsible German ministers, would seem to be really one for re-armament and, therefore, is contrary to the spirit and object of the Conference. The League must be the sole judge.

Face the
Facts.

Both the German and French Notes are masterly, diplomatic documents, but the German is more in touch with reality. Whatever be the legal aspects of the case, the fact remains that a first-class Power is being kept in a subordinate position and what are reckoned as normal requisites for security by other Powers are forbidden to Germany. And the situation in Germany itself is very precarious. The Government rests upon the sole will of a very old man; its existence in a republican form is in jeopardy; unless it can secure recognition of its rights of self-defence, or an undertaking that other first-class Powers will base their security, as it has, willy-nilly, to do, on friendship instead of on force, it will be superseded by a militarist regime, whose policy is to repudiate Versailles altogether. The British statement on the German Note, issued on September 18th, whilst wisely enough siding with France on the necessity of using the League machinery for revising a general Treaty, took little account of Germany's critical condition when it characterized the

Note as "untimely." It is, on the contrary, a case of "now or never." Mr. Henderson, speaking the day before the statement, showed a truer grasp of the needs of the situation.

The German claim to re-arm [he said] would present the Bureau of the Conference, and eventually the Conference itself, with its most crucial situation. Why should not the former Allied and Associated Powers at once get together and recognize that what was done in their names in 1919 imposed on them an obligation from which they could not escape? Why should they not at once publicly declare that it was their intention to restore Germany and the other vanquished Powers, with all possible haste, to equality of military status?

Let them produce a practical programme of substantial and comprehensive disarmament, as stated in their own resolution, which was accepted by the Conference, by forty-one votes to two, last July. Let those countries that were responsible for the resolution on qualitative disarmament, dealing with what they said were the most offensive weapons, ignore the experts who tried to turn every offensive weapon into a defensive weapon. If they would do this the problem that confronted the Conference, as the result of an old demand coming up with a new urge, could be adjusted.

At the Bureau of the Conference was begun, on September 21st, the preparation of the agenda for its next session, notice having been given a week before of Germany's decision not to attend. It is to be hoped that Mr. Henderson's letter to the Reich's Foreign Minister, in which he denied that any limits to universal disarmament were fixed by the final resolutions of the first phase of the Conference on July 23rd, will have the effect of reversing that decision. *The Times* asks (September 19th), "Is it not possible to say now to Germany that categorical restrictions, which are not, within a certain period, imposed upon all by the Disarmament Convention, will no longer be imposed on her?" and further suggests "that the statesmen who are meeting in the Bureau of the Disarmament Conference should come to an early decision as to whether they are prepared to abrogate the clauses in Part V. of the Versailles Treaty, which may be found inconsistent with the terms of a new Disarmament Convention." This counsel points the way to a real and speedy reduction of the means of war—and will, alas! certainly be scouted and opposed by those who depend on war for their dividends. As things are, the rejection of the Hoover plan has resulted in a spurt in naval construction. A new British programme, calculated to cost £20,000,000 in the next two years, was announced on August 10th. The United States, we learned on August 15th, are to build immediately, under the London agreement, three very powerful armoured cruisers.

France, the *Daily Telegraph* (August 18th) says, will, before the late autumn, commission fifteen new submarines of the latest type. And Germany starts her third cruiser on October 1st. A little more vigour and decision in the Conference would probably have saved all this unconscionable waste of our substance. Who are the gainers?

**Another Aspect
of
Re-armament.**

Catholics, however, have higher than financial reasons for deploring anything that makes for the re-arming of Germany, such as the refusal of other nations to abandon weapons of offence

and scale down their equipments to the requirements of world peace. The chief one is that the re-awakening of Prussianism would jeopardize the hard-won frontiers of that ancient Catholic nation, Poland; the preservation of which is a matter of vast importance, not only to the Catholic Faith, but also to the Western civilization on which that Faith is based. If Prussianism again becomes dominant in Germany, there will be a determined effort to "rectify" her present frontiers by abolishing what is called the Polish Corridor, which means depriving Poland of access to the sea. If Germany re-arms because the other Powers refuse to disarm, she will surely aim at naval predominance in the Baltic for the protection of her ports. Now, it is the expressed purpose both of the militarists and the Nazis, to tear up the Versailles Treaty on which the present settlement of Europe depends. Yet East Prussia has no real grievance. Before the First Partition of 1772, the tiny Kingdom of Prussia, corresponding practically to the modern East Prussia, was entirely surrounded by Polish territory. Its renewed isolation is, doubtless, inconvenient, but no more: if there has to be geographical awkwardness, it is preferable that two million people, rather than thirty million, should suffer it. In the circumstances, the strength and integrity of Poland, placed now as a bulwark between Christian civilization and the alien atheist culture of Russia, is a pivotal factor in European welfare. It is sad to see how the English Press generally, with its anti-Catholic bias, consistently ignores what Poland has done, and what Poland is doing, to preserve from a worse than Turkish invasion the sanctities which decent persons hold dear—the honour of God, the rights of conscience, the integrity of the family, the liberty of the individual, the brotherhood of man. Rather than see a Catholic nation prosper, these reckless journalists try to misrepresent it in every way, calling it militarist, intransigent, ambitious. It is to be feared that some of them, in their blind ignorance, would prefer to welcome a Germany re-Prussianized than a vigorous independent Catholic Poland. And some, atheists at heart, would hail the advance of atheist Russia over that hallowed land. Catholics at least know where their duty lies.

**The
Economic Crisis
Continues.**

Policies are tested by results. Much is being said about the coming revival of trade and the return of prosperity. But judged by the most eloquent of tests—the reduction of unemployment—the state of industry is growing worse rather than better. It may be too soon to appreciate fairly the results of the Commonwealth agreements at Ottawa and how far they are likely to fulfil the declared purpose of the leaders there, viz., to drive a fresh current through the stagnant pools of world-trade and stimulate rather than check world-revival. Unless they do so, we are not likely to benefit, since the universal depression is precisely due to artificial interference with commerce: how they can do so remains a mystery, for, what are called Empire Preferences cannot, *vi verbi*, be preferential unless they discriminate against non-Empire products. Already those adversely affected—the Argentine, Denmark, France—are complaining of restrictions on their trade, and there is, as yet, no compensation in the absorption of more workers into industry. In this country alone, unemployment has grown since August last year by 126,000—in spite of all the National Government could do—and now nearly one-fourth of our working population is practically idle. During the same period, two hundred thousand more acres of food-producing land have gone out of cultivation, which is almost as great an instance of human folly as is the frequent destruction of crops already grown. Idle lands, idle hands—cannot the wit of man, so superlatively skilful in devising means of making money and in turning general human needs into occasions of personal profit,—devise some scheme whereby the livelihood of the individual is first secured before he is exploited for the benefit of someone else?

**Moral Remedies
for a
Moral Disease.**

It is for Catholics, unwearyingly, to proclaim the remedy for this moral disease which prevents the marvellous fruits of human skill and industry from benefiting the multitude, and reduces the majority of mankind to conditions of sub-human drudgery. Let us not allow "Quadragesimo Anno" to meet the fate of "Rerum Novarum"—a brief season of admiration and praise and then all but complete oblivion. Before the end of the year, the World Conference will meet—here in London or in Washington—to consider the Restoration of World Prosperity, the setting in motion again of that interchange of benefits between races and nations on which their material welfare depends. Will they have the courage and insight to keep in view that masterly diagnosis of the world's ills—"On the Reconstruction of the Social Order"—wherein the Pope, alone amongst the world's leaders and statesmen, has told the world's misguided capitalists and working folk the truth. He deals only with facts which are known, but are kept out of sight or misinterpreted: facts which all the same must be recognized if justice is to prevail. The first

is "the accumulation of wealth and consequently the concentration of immense power and despotic economic domination, in the hands of a few."¹ Here His Holiness has in mind the great banking concerns, for he goes on to say that they can govern credit and determine its allotment at will, holding thus irresponsible sway over the whole economic body. These few groups of all-powerful corporations disturb the whole social order by their struggles for trade-domination, for control of the State itself, and finally for the supremacy of their own particular nation. And so the skilful surgeon goes on, revealing with his pitiless yet healing knife the deep-seated maladies which unnecessarily afflict mankind,—unnecessarily, for they are the fruit of human perversity and can be checked by human laws, as, indeed, they were in united Christendom. But will these facts be considered in the World Economic Conference, and something be done to release the world from the stranglehold of Mammon? We fear that many of his votaries will be seated at the Conference-board, and Mammon cannot be cast out by the aid of Mammon. Nor yet will Socialism, also tried and found wanting by the Pope, provide a remedy. Religion alone has the power to heal.

**"A
Few Rich
Men."**

No Socialist writer, not even Mr. H. G. Wells himself, has exposed so clearly the evil effects on the community of the mal-distribution of wealth as the Pope does in this forcible Encyclical. For it is in the injustice of godless Capitalism that the Bolsheviks find the most effective pleas for recommending their own godless remedies. Following the Pope's lead, a writer in *The Commonweal* (November 4, 1931), described what results from Capitalism in these vivid terms—"As the world is now constituted, not only is it impossible for the masses of human beings to attain financial independence, but vast hordes everywhere are unable to make a decent living." Financial independence may readily be forgone; the majority must always earn their livelihood by work of some sort; but a humane standard of life,— "frugal comfort," in Pope Leo's phrase—is the right of all, and something is wrong with the society in which it is unattainable. What is wrong is the multi-millionaire. "In all countries," continues *The Commonweal* writer, "money has accumulated in the hands of so few that the buying power of the great mass of the population is not sufficient to consume the production of the over-developed capacity of industries, producing the necessities of life." In other words, the profits of industry, instead of being more liberally distributed to the worker, who is the main consumer, have been devoted to a speeding-up of production, until there is a glut of commodities, not because they are unwanted, but because there is no money to buy them. Thus blind avarice

¹ "Quadragesimo Anno" (C.T.S.), p. 46.

has cut its own throat. Again, we ask, is there likely to be anyone attending the World Economic Conference who will insist upon this fact of observation? In a volume, elsewhere reviewed, which we earnestly recommend to the study of Catholics who wish to interpret aright the financial world in which they live, the Papal teaching is discussed in detail, in the chapter headed "The Social Question," (pp. 242, sqq). Judged by that teaching the lives of the great financiers, as recorded, for instance, in our Encyclopædias, show an almost entire absence of moral principle. Not that they are conscious criminals, but it seemingly did not even occur to them that many things that are not forbidden by civil law may yet be violations of the divine.

**Methodist
Reunion.**

Most people who do not belong to the body, and perhaps many who do, will wonder, when they read the imposing account of the solemn reunion of the various Methodist sects, on September 20th, why they were ever divided. The history of the body is, indeed, remarkable for the number of secessions that occurred, and, more lately, for the gradual fusion of different parties amongst the dissidents. Some of the secessions arose on mere questions of discipline, such as the relative proportions of lay and ministerial influence, and the use of music in their services. The Welsh Calvinistic Methodists, who were not founded by Wesley but by Whitefield, and various smaller bodies, are presumably not included in the new amalgamation. In the U.S.A. there is a Methodist Episcopal Church, a very large group, itself split into two, which adheres to the institution of Bishops, vehemently repudiated by the British body. Sir Robert Perks, who has been a persistent advocate of reunion all his life, declares (*Daily Mail*, September 22nd), "We have no doctrinal differences whatever—none," and stresses the fact that the Act of Union provides "that upon one vital point there can be no change—that is, on the doctrinal standards of the newly-united Church." Well, we shall see: so long as the principle of disunion—the right of personal interpretation both of Scripture and Creeds,—remains, as it does, intact, it would be strange if it did not produce its natural effects. Of course, if one is told—"These are our formulæ: read what meanings you like into them," there need be no doctrinal differences,—openly expressed. However, on the grounds of this complete doctrinal unanimity, Sir Robert rather cruelly infers that there can be no question of union with the Church of England, as, quite apart from its radical Episcopacy, that Church, Bishops and all, "is, on doctrinal issues, divided into two hostile groups." On the other hand, he quotes with approval Wesley's advice to his followers to be "the friends of all and the enemies of none," and we hope that the newly-united body will always exhibit that spirit. It was the now venerable Sir Robert Perks, we remember, who, on occasion of the London Eucharistic Congress of 1908,

made himself conspicuous by the intolerant protest—"The Methodist people do not intend to have the Host carried through the streets of their cities." We should be glad to believe that this pretentious interference with the beliefs and worship of others would be repudiated now, both by its author, and by the body, the union of which he has done so much to bring about.

**The
"Irish Academy of
Letters."**

Since Joseph Smith, in 1830, conferred the Episcopacy in the Mormon Church on Brigham Young, who forthwith bestowed the same office on the donor, nothing more remarkable in the way of autogeny has occurred than the creation, by Messrs. G. B. Shaw and W. B. Yeats, of the new "Irish Academy of Letters," consisting of twenty-five full members and ten associates, nominated apparently without their consent. The list was given to the Press on September 20th, so there has been little time for any of the elect to repudiate his inclusion, but we can hardly think that the few practising Catholics amongst those "nominated" would care to be associated with the immoralists who figure so largely in the membership. As we wrote, when the idea was mooted in April by Mr. Yeats, who had mentioned "some obvious preliminary choices"—"these nominees of his include several writers whose attitude to truth, religion and decency, as revealed in their writings, is a cause of shame to every Irish person who values the Christian traditions of the race. . . . If the proposed Academy is not to be the laughing-stock of the nation from the start, members must be selected who may be trusted not to flout the ethical principles on which Irish civilization, and indeed all genuine culture, is based." And we went on to point out that the moral ideals of those unfettered geniuses, who all appear, with additions, on the final list, are precisely the same as those of the Bolsheviks. The fact that the Government has been compelled to ban not a few of the books produced by these worthies gives the real motive for the election of this preposterous body. It is meant to be a protest against the Censorship of Books. It might, indeed, be styled a "Protective Association for Emancipated Authors," but it is not likely to meet with any support from Christian lovers of literature. Nor will the Censor be less, but rather more, careful in his consideration of works by writers who can put I.A.L.—a stigma rather than an honour—after their names.

**Catholicism
versus
Communism and
its Allies.**

Although the said Censor is, in the opinion of many, much too timid in the exercise of his functions, we do not think that he would readily admit "The Necessity of Communism," by Mr. Middleton Murry, into the Free State. The Archbishop of Liverpool, on September 12th, put before a Congress of Franciscan Tertiaries the main thesis of that production, which is the destruction of the only religion that counts, Catholicism, by the growth

of Marxian Communism. Mr. Murry pays us the compliment of acknowledging that we alone profess "the necessary unity of faith and action" and "the requisite obedience to legitimate authority," which constitute a disciplined army. The last Papal Encyclical has already in specific terms described the disciplined army of our foes,—

To-day atheism has already spread through large masses of the people; well organized, it works its way even into elementary schools; it appears in theatres; in order to spread, it makes use of its own cinema films, of the gramophone and the radio; with its own printing presses, it produces booklets in every language; it promotes special exhibitions and public parades; it has formed its own political parties and its own economic and military systems. This organized and militant atheism works untiringly by means of its agitators, with conferences and lectures, with every means of propaganda, secret and open, among all classes, in every street, in every hall; it secures for this nefarious activity the moral support of its own universities, and holds fast the unwary with the mighty bonds of its organizing power—

and has called upon Catholics to close their ranks for battle.

**The
Allies.**

In the circumstances, and at this time, it is not a little strange that two leaders of the Protestant Church in this country should feel obliged to renew their periodical attacks on the foremost upholder of the Christian faith and morals. Yet Bishop Barnes, speaking to the "Modern Churchmen," on September 4th, described us as hopelessly sunk in superstition and opposed to science. Dean Inge, at the same gathering next day, accused Catholics of essential obscurantism—"They do not think, or argue; they know." On the other hand he, too, echoes Mr. Murry in acknowledging our power. "The Revolutionary Movement, [he said] which aims at uprooting all the cultural traditions of the past, is more hostile to Catholicism than to Protestantism." Are we to argue from the Dean's constant and unprovoked assaults on us that he sides with the Revolutionary Movement? These outbursts do little harm, since they are discounted by the known characters of those who utter them. In fact, we could almost wish, in the interests of orthodoxy, that the "Modern Churchmen" would meet and orate once a week instead of only once a year. Nothing so shows up the inanity, the folly and the staleness of what is called "Modernism" as do the utterances of its few but voluble supporters. Dr. Major, for instance, called for "A New Reformation," since Christian theology needs "an immense purgation" especially of such unessentials as the Mass and the Episcopate. And, apparently, the agent of this new Reformation is to be—the State! Will he, too, call in Russia?

THE EDITOR.

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

Bellarmino, The Sacramental Principle in [M. L. Balam, S.J., in *Month*, October 1932, p. 308].

Lying, The Ethics of [Ph. Moreau in *Revue Apologetique*, September 1932, p. 295].

"Mediate Animation," Theology of [Rev. E. C. Messenger in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, September 1932, p. 281].

Sacramental Grace [P. Gounin in *Revue Apologetique* August—September, 1932].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

Anti-Catholic Bigotry and German Politics [*Commonweal*, September 14, 1932, p. 461].

Broadmindedness: misapplied to Heresy [Father Rope in *Catholic Gazette*, September 1932, p. 272].

Catholic Action in France: Organization of [*Catholic Action* September 1932, p. 5].

Catholic Truth Guild of U.S.A., Work of [D. Goldstein, quoted in *Catholic Action*, September 1932, p. 36].

Child, The fight for the Child in Russia and Germany ["Custos" in *Columbia*, September 1932, p. 269].

Mohammedan Congresses [Bishop d'Herbigny in *Etudes*, June 20, 1932, p. 641].

Poland, Assertion of Church's rights in [Cardinal Llonc in *Documentation Catholique*, June 25, 1932, p. 1667].

Protestant Proselytism in Italy [*Civiltà Cattolica*, September 17, 1932, p. 521].

Revolution disguised as Peace [G. M. Godden in *Tablet*, September 10, 1932, p. 332].

Slums, The, and the Soul [C. C. Martindale, S.J., in *Month*, October 1932, p. 289].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

Catholic Land Colonization [E. Schmiedeler, O.S.B., in *Catholic Action*, September 1932, p. 7].

Catholics and Social Justice [C. C. Martindale, S.J., in *America*, September 10, 1932, p. 540].

Missal, The Roman, in the Frankish Church [C. W. Donnelly, S.J., in *Clergy Review*, September 1932, p. 173].

Peace, Church's constant work for [J. F. Thorning, S.J., in *Ecclesiastical Review*, August 1932, p. 124].

Science, The Bankruptcy of: admitted by President of British Association [*Universe*, September 9, 1932, p. 10].

Spain: Documented survey of the Republic's First Year [*Documentation Catholique*, July 2, August 13, 1932].

War-traders prevent Disarmament [T. W. C. Curd in *Catholic Times*, August 26, September 2, 1932].

Work or Maintenance: Ethics of [J. E. Donnelly, S.J., in *America*, September 10, 1932, p. 545].

REVIEWS

1—THE JEWS AND CHRISTIANITY¹

THE first book is a substantial addition to the "History of Civilization" series. According to secular standards, its author is thoroughly well equipped for his colossal task: to him the Bible is simply an ancient compilation to be tested ruthlessly by all the available criteria. He adopts the views of the main body of Higher Critics. Still, he does not appear to have any vulgar anti-religious bias. He is familiar with the archæology of the Semitic peoples, and studies the Hebrew immigrant—"chabira"—in the concrete with his Babylonian and Canaanitish background. According to him, Israel did not so much introduce new rites, but rather infused a new spirit into immemorial customs. A modified belief in Baalim and demonic forces, which had to be propitiated according to the rites of the land, lingered on for generations, all the titles and attributes of the local gods being transferred to Jehovah. It was idols made from molten metal that were specially denounced, the people retaining for centuries a fond fancy for the idea that divine powers dwelt in stones and trees. Monotheism in any adequate sense of the term was slow in its development; but when it did come, with Amos as its first spokesman, it came with stored up energy and force.

Such a book may well be dangerous to the unlearned. At the same time it has its advantages. We feel that, whatever the author admits that we should like him to admit,—and there is much—is absolutely incontrovertible. He provides us also with a singularly rich quarry of reliable information. With him as guide the reader becomes almost at home with the ancient races of the Near East. Their interactions and idiosyncrasies stand out in clear relief. Aegeans, Egyptians, Babylonians and Hittites provided the chief elements of general culture; but Canaan, in spite of cruelty and lust, is credited with having furnished at least the skeleton of what was to become Judaism. A grand transformation had first to be effected.

There are, of course, a few blemishes of one sort or another. "The Dead Sea legend"—Sodom and Gomorrah—is alluded to somewhat cavalierly as a "geographical explanatory story." Yes;

¹ (1) *Israel from its Beginnings to the Middle of the Eighth Century*. By Adolphe Lods. Translated by S. H. Hooke. London: Kegan Paul. Thirty-eight illustrations. Pp. 448. Price, 25s. 1932. (2) *The Zohar in Moslem and Christian Spain*. By Ariel Bension. London: Routledge. Six illustrations. Pp. 264. Price, 12s. 6d.

but it may be the true explanation. The difficulty about Cain on his wanderings meeting other human beings is similarly handled.

The translation is excellent. "And which" may sometimes be justified by grammarians; but the prudent man avoids it. Three instances of this undesirable usage may be found, on p. 233, p. 473 and p. 474 (top). In one sentence the thought is clumsily expressed. It is in connection with the date of the occupation of Palestine: "Let us say about the period between 1500 and 1200." But these are small matters.

On the whole the book on the Zohar presents an aspect of Judaism which has much in common with Catholicism. The author is conscious of this and always sympathetic. It is lack of knowledge that misleads him into speaking of the mysticism of St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross as pantheistic. He has nothing but admiration for them and for Ramon Lull. Unlike the vast majority of Jews he strives to forget, or even to extenuate, the severities of the Inquisition (p. 60). Such generosity makes one feel very kindly towards Ariel Bension.

The Zohar has the advantage of being in fashion at present and the complete translation from the original Aramaic, which is being prepared by Rev. P. P. Levertoff, D.D., should make it more so. It is full of beauty, but its charm is somewhat marred by a spirit of exaggeration. Simeon Ben Jochai, the legendary Rabbi of the second century A.D. on whom Moses de Leon (1250-1305) has fathered the authorship, is presented to us out of all reasonable proportion. He excels Moses and all the Christian saints in all the wonders which he works. Worse still, he has an overweening conviction that he and his son are pre-eminent in sanctity. Amusing examples of this may be found on pp. 93 sq.

Were Jews more generally in sympathy with the Zohar, it would be much less difficult to reconcile them to the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation. If space allowed, half a dozen passages might be quoted which should predispose any open-minded person towards these beliefs. Unfortunately the Talmud exercises far greater influence than the Zohar, and rationalism outstrips them both.

The English is excellent; but it would seem—p. 59—that for "novitiate" should be read "novice." There is an "Explanation of Foreign Words," but one looks in vain for "Or Cadmon"—p. 239; nor is it in the index. The word which other writers spell "Sephardi" is invariably written "Sepharadi." We are told that there are seven classes in Paradise: "in the sixth are the celibates, those who have committed no sin" (p. 51). This is an unusual definition; if accepted it would remove all objection to the celibacy of the clergy!

A.D.

2—A GREAT CATHOLIC¹

MANY of us were sorry when Bertram Windle left Birmingham for Cork; and sorrier still, when he left Cork for Canada: but we should have to be ashamed of ourselves indeed if at any time we had forgotten him, and to feel ourselves disgraced, were his name to fade from our grateful memories, now that he is dead.

Hence we trust that, despite its price, this biography will be bought by many and by no means only borrowed. We hope that it will be read aloud in every seminary or house of studies: we trust that no group of University Students will fail to obtain it at least in triplicate—it ought always to be in use and also handy for reference: and we hope that it will regularly be given as a prize in the higher classes of schools. This implies that the book is—and indeed it is—suited to different sorts of readers, and to many more than those we have indicated. It is, to start with, written most lucidly: the style is dignified, because simple, and yet, adequate throughout to so difficult a task as describing so many-sided a life and occupations so often technical. Further, the book is extremely full; possibly a second edition (soon we hope to be needed) may contain an added fact or two; but the book is at once authoritative and will remain a classic. Again, the author effaces herself with perfect modesty—this does not exclude shrewd and illuminating comments—so as to permit letters and Windle's printed word to take the front place throughout. She is, moreover, perfectly equipped to cope with the scientific side of Windle's career; and, what was supremely necessary, to enter into his spiritual life which transfused all the rest. Without this understanding, the book would have been useless. Windle's greatness consisted, not only in his profound knowledge of many things, but in his absolute probity. This too was the source of many of his sorrows. Partisans would have wished him partisan. This he *could* not be. As it is, few were more able than he to guide an honest mind through the reefs that torment us—England and the Church: the Faith and Science: Ireland and England: Europe and the New World and Canada in particular. Nor did he confine his assistance to official occasions, so to say: his affectionateness was so directly appreciable, his sympathy so intimate without any touch of intrusiveness, that he was as welcome in those secret places where a soul—especially an immature, restless soul—may at last reveal its own bitterness, as he was on lecture-platforms or at a committee-table. He could engineer and organize, without making

¹ *Sir Bertram Windle*. By Monica Taylor, S.N.D., D.Sc. London: Longmans. Pp. xiii. 428. Price, 12s. 6d. 1932.

anyone feel he was being caught up into cogs; and he could minister to minds diseased (or merely uncomfortable!), without allowing them to think that private health exempted them from duties round about.

I cannot disguise my regret that, towards the end of his life, Sir Bertram Windle seemed to me to dissipate his energies and to be too willing to write about all sorts of things. I cannot feel he was so wise when he tackled, for example, comparative religion or Roman archæology. But for so active and "interesting" and ever-young a mind, the temptation must have been appalling; the more so, as he was continually being invited to give his views on all sorts of disparate topics. Now, when young men and women need such guidance, and when no authorized person consents to come forward to supply it—what can a man like Windle do, save step into the gap and offer what he can?

It remains that here we have a complete and undeviating man. Certainly, his scientific mind pursued through all difficulties its untiring course. Certainly, from the moment of his conversion, his spiritual life shone steadily more and more. Far from me to suggest that he hadn't his hours of anguish, and (as a lad) of rebelliousness: but his loyalty was absolute—in fact, perhaps "integrity" combined with a resolute adherence to the "first-rate" are the elements I should single out in him to emphasize. But he was incorruptible, not because he was frozen: his "loftiness" was not inhumanity, like that of Browning's Grammarian. It was to this writer a lasting grief when he knew he could receive no more letters signed: affectionately yours, B.C.A.W.

C.C.M.

3—SOCIAL SCIENCE¹

FATHER Cahill's profound and extensive study of what the organization of human society should be if it is to accord with the fact of Christianity, is easily the most important book for the Catholic social student that has appeared in English since Charles S. Devas, forty years ago, subjected, in his famous "Political Economy," the godless commercialism of the day to the test of Catholic principles. In spite of the difference of scope and approach, many of the problems discussed and the evils diagnosed are the same in both books, but the later writer has the natural advantage of contemplating a wider and more prolonged exhibition of the baneful results of the world's abandonment of its due search for the Kingdom of God and His justice, as well as the help of a more detailed exposition and

¹ *The Framework of a Christian State: an Introduction to Social Science.* By the Rev. E. Cahill, S.J. Dublin: Gill & Son. Pp. xxvii, 701. Price, 15s. n.

application of true principles by the highest Catholic authorities. The volume, the matter of which has been worked over in several series of lectures and discussions, and ventilated serially in public periodicals, is obviously the fruit both of wide reading and close observation. It embraces a consideration of the pagan "civilization" into which the leaven of Christianity was originally introduced and its early reactions to that divine stimulus, and then follows a description of the part played by the Church in preserving what was good in the Roman Empire, and in taming the barbarians who overthrew it. This historical foundation is completed by a sketch of the influence of Catholicism in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. By that time the character of Christian civilization had become sufficiently developed to be susceptible of scientific analysis, and the author gets to grips with his subject in a detailed exposition of the Social and Political Principles of Christendom. This forms the substance of the treatise, but both its bulk and its value are increased by a discussion of the various erroneous principles and ideals which, especially since the disruption of Christendom, have interfered with the due development of the Christian culture, and have produced the chaos both in morals and politics which distracts the world to-day. Although pride and covetousness were prolific in disorder even when the world was mainly Catholic, these vices did not receive a legal, and even a pseudo-religious, sanction till after the guidance of the Church was rejected, and men largely lost sight of that other supernatural world which explains and redresses the imperfections of this. The disastrous economic effects of Protestant individualism, systematized in what is essentially anti-Christian "Liberalism," and the source of all the evils of Capitalism, receive a merciless exposure, as do the inevitable recoil from such inhuman perversions—the phenomena of Communism and Bolshevism. The author's wide acquaintance with Freemasonry enables him to present a faithful picture of this anti-social, as well as anti-Christian, force, under the inspiration of which are now being marshalled all the enemies of God and the supernatural.

Against this background of error, destructive not only of man's spiritual but also of his temporal well-being, the Second Part of the work sets forth those principles which, drawn from the revelation of Christ but already embodied in the Natural Law, have always, when recognized, preserved the world from error and corruption—the rights of the soul, of the Family, of the State, violation of which is the source of all our woe. In view of our actual needs, this will perhaps prove the most useful section of the book, for it constantly keeps in view the present condition of things, in Ireland and elsewhere, and shows wherein it falls short of the standard. Father Cahill, then, considers the mutual

relations of the partners in the marriage contract, the infeasible rights of parent and child, of the State and of the Church, in the matter of education, the problem of hired Labour, the particular status of woman, the nature and functions of organized civil society *vis à vis* the claims of God, and, finally, the position, both actual and ideal, of the Catholic Church in the modern State. Three valuable appendices consider the special application of Catholic social and political doctrine to the particular circumstances of the newly recognized national State of Ireland, when the soil, in itself most favourable for the blossoming of Christian principles, has for long been oversown with imported weeds. Father Cahill is, in this matter, both severe and just, and we may easily judge that, in elaborating the duties of a Christian citizen towards State and Church alike, he has had his own countrymen mainly in view.

In regard to the wide compass of the book, it is only natural that there should be views on which even Catholics may differ, points that need further development, arguments inadequately supported. We may trust the students and professors, whom it is sure to attract, to find, and prompt the reconsideration of, such defects. The author himself admits (p. 277) occasional too summary treatment, and, indirectly, promises a future Third Part, which shall deal more fully with such "actual" topics, as Interest and Usury, Money, Taxation, etc. We may ourselves call attention to an omission which, in present-day conditions, is surely regrettable. The Christian State has few better opportunities of proving its Christianity than in its conduct towards other States, which, no less than its domestic behaviour, should be characterized by charity as well as justice. A whole new range of inter-State obligations have been undertaken since the Great War, the effects of which have not yet been fully explored by the Christian moralist. Let us hope that in a second edition, or in a new treatise, Father Cahill will engage on this task, and add considerably to the already great obligations under which he has placed us in the present work.

SHORT NOTICES

PHILOSOPHICAL.

STUDENTS of philosophy will welcome Père, Garrigou-Lagrange's new book, *Le Réalisme du Principe de Finalité* (Desclée: 20.00 fr.). Here we have the cultured and expert Thomist, testing the doctrine of St. Thomas by modern standards, and also modern standards by means of St. Thomas. It is an exposition of the Aristotelean and Thomistic teaching of the *Causa finalis*, the truth that nothing is done without a purpose; *Omne agens agit propter finem*, whether the agent is a conscious agent

or not. This leads him to discuss the meaning and content of morality and obedience, which, it would seem, the author has chiefly in mind through the book. As he moves from point to point he meets the opinions and theses of other authors, Kant, Descartes, Malebranche, Leibnitz, and modern philosophers such as Le Roy, Gilson, and P. Picard; in an excellent section he opposes modern pantheism and agnosticism one to the other. Not unnaturally, when he comes to the question of the source of our knowledge of the supernatural, he finds a target in the Jesuit Fathers, from de Lugo to Billot, represented by such modern writers as Rousselot and Huby, who, no doubt, will be able to look after themselves. Père Garrigou-Lagrange writes on philosophy with fascinating ease. It is never difficult to follow him; on the contrary, there are few writers, even, we think, in France, so skilled in developing an abstract thesis in language which an untrained student can understand.

MORAL THEOLOGY.

In two carefully-divided and well-written volumes, entitled *Les Passions dans la Vie Morale* (Lethielleux, Paris: 30 fr.), the Rev. Father H. D. Noble, O.P., blends the doctrine of St. Thomas with the latest results of modern psychological research. The first volume, *Psychologie de la Passion* is naturally more occupied with the results of the laboratories. While retaining the definitions and divisions of Aquinas, and the relation of passion to will as explained by the Angelic Doctor, the author goes deeply into the question of the power of passion, with full acknowledgement of all that modern experimental psychology had to tell us. Though granting accidental errors, due to lack of knowledge, which was characteristic of the thirteenth century, he shows, nevertheless, how the fundamental teaching of the Schools not only is unimpaired by recent discoveries, but alone gives those discoveries a practical meaning. In a concluding chapter he submits most of the conclusions of modern psychologists to close criticism, and champions the empire of free will over the tyranny of passion, from whatever source it may come.

The second volume, *Moralité de la Passion*, takes us over ground more familiar to the scholastic philosopher or moral theologian, but does it with careful analysis, and with an eye still upon the declarations and tendencies of modern moralists. While in the former volume he asserts the power and function of the will over passion, in this he emphasizes the difference between passion and sin. Passion is not sin; passion may be, and ought to be, a source of merit; though passion may be the most universal source of sin, yet, under the control of the moral virtues, prudence and justice, it may lead to sanctity. This is the thread running through the book. As in the former he championed free will, so here he champions responsibility. As he nears the conclusion of his argument, the author rises to eloquence, with a note of encouragement and even of optimism, in marked contrast to the pessimism of those who would look on passion as a slavery and a doom. Both volumes are exceedingly well documented. The bibliography shows an acquaintance with practically every psychologist of note, to whatever School he may belong.

CANON LAW.

High praise has been given in these pages to the volumes of the Commentary on the Code of Canon Law due to the work of the late Very Rev. H. A. Ayrinhac, President and Professor of Moral Theology and Canon Law at St. Patrick's Seminary, Menlo Park, California. We can only repeat this praise apropos of the three volumes of the series, published now by Messrs. Longmans, which have come to hand. In the volume entitled **General Legislation** (12s. 6d. n.), Dr. Ayrinhac deals with the "Normae Generales" or General Principles of the Code (Canons 1—86) and with those canons which affect all clerics generally (Canons 87—214). In an introduction we have a good account of the history of the Canon Law, its various divisions, and the relations of Canon Law, especially, with the civil law.

In **The Constitution of the Church** (12s. 6d. n.), the author deals with the Holy See, the Cardinals, Roman Congregations and Tribunals, with the law touching plenary and provincial councils, vicars and pre-fects-apostolic. That is followed in the order of the Code by an explanation of the Canons dealing with bishops, diocesan synods, the vicar-general and other officials, cathedral and collegiate canons, with the laws in force *Sede Vacante*, with the duties of vicars forane and finally with the law relating to parish priests.

In the volume **Administrative Legislation** (Part II.: 12s. 6d. n.), we have a sequel to the volume on the Sacraments already reviewed here. The law dealt with is that relating to churches and oratories, altars, Christian burial, holidays of obligation, abstinence and fasting, then that touching the cultus of the Holy Eucharist, with sacred images and relics, processions and church furniture. After a section following the order of the Code dealing with vows and oaths, we come to the commentary on the Canons which have to do with the teaching office of the Church. Here we have the regulations with regard to catechetical instruction, the preaching of sermons and the giving of missions. Then comes a section dealing with seminaries and schools. That is followed by the part of the Code which has reference to the censorship and forbidding of books. The book ends with an explanation of the canons dealing with benefices, administration of Church property and the law touching charitable and religious institutions.

Dr. Ayrinhac's method is, first of all, to give the history of the law or institution with which he is dealing. Then he gives his explanation of the Canons concerned which is generally a sound one, as the author was certainly a very competent canonist. There is also, of course, frequent and useful reference to other canonists. As far as we know, this is the best commentary in English on the Code. We have noticed two slips; namely,—Can. 101 orders the president of the meeting of an ecclesiastical corporation to settle the matter under discussion by his casting vote, in case of a deadlock after the third scrutiny of the votes. He may thus use his discretion, only when there is question of an election. Further it is not accurate to say that the decree of the Consistorial, laying down regulations for the clergy in regard to dances, binds the whole Church. It was issued only to the United States and to Canada. Such inaccuracies are the exception. The work can be confidently recommended to all students of the Canon Law.

APOLOGETIC.

It is an inevitable consequence of their non-Catholic surroundings that Catholics should be exposed on every side to assaults on their philosophy and their faith. All the agencies for disseminating knowledge—the press in its widest sense, the universities, the B.B.C.—are for the most part in non-Catholic hands and, even without being actuated by hostility to Catholics, must needs promulgate much which ignores or contradicts their cherished beliefs. Hence the extreme advantage to the Catholic cause of those champions who, duly equipped with mental acumen and literary skill, can meet the most formidable opponents on their own ground, and by the use of the very ordinary weapon of common sense, can expose and overthrow them. Foremost amongst these champions is Father Ronald Knox, and those who applauded the task he achieved in *Caliban in Grub Street*, wherein he exploded the pretensions of a number of journalists, will welcome his encounters with certain philosophers and scientists, recorded in *Broadcast Minds* (Sheed & Ward: 7s. 6d. n.). In this volume his chief opponents, or victims, are Earl Russell and Professor Julian Huxley, and he arraigns them on the charge of trying to overawe the vulgar by an affectation of omniscience. The "omniscientists," in fact,—writers who lay claim to knowing "the last word" and hold that their particular "gnosis" has finally routed religion, are his particular game. Only a public mentality long debauched and atrophied by the negations of Protestantism could give a patient hearing, not to say an obsequious assent, to these solemn sciolists, and Father Knox is in his element when pricking with his deft rapier their swollen conceit. Less boisterous than Mr. Harvey Wickham, whose volume—*The Unrealists*—had much the same object, Father Knox is equally successful in sapping with his lively wit the "solemn sneers" of this batch of After-Christians.

The Catholic Catechism, drawn up by His Eminence Cardinal Gasparri, (Sheed & Ward: 7s. 6d.), is a book which every educated Catholic, and especially every teacher, should possess and consult. The work comprises three Catechisms, the first for little children before they have received their First Communion, to whom the answers are to be explained by the teacher; the second is for children who have made their First Communion; the third is for adults. The purpose of the Catechism is not only full instruction in Catholic doctrine, but guidance in conduct. The work is enriched with many notes which are of great help and interest. The appendices, of which there are seven, form a substantial part of the book, comprising over four hundred pages, and setting out in full the ecclesiastical documents quoted in the notes. The last appendix deals with some questions which are matters of controversy amongst theologians.

BIBLICAL.

Biblical students will welcome the new edition made to the well-known series of "Études Bibliques," by M. J. Chaine, Professor of Holy Scripture at the Catholic faculty of Lyons. Its title *Introduction à la lecture des Prophètes* (Gabalda: 20.00 fr.) expresses admirably the nature of the contents. The author puts the prophecies into the historical setting in which they were uttered, and, in easy flowing narrative,

sets forth the meaning of the more important passages. The pages are not overburdened with erudition, and the educated reader will find this literary commentary very helpful towards acquiring a deeper understanding of some of the masterpieces of the Old Testament. We may remark that the writer takes the Emmanuel prophecy as Messianic in the literal sense, but he does not show how on this explanation any sign was offered to Achaz. If the prophecy is Messianic in the typical sense only, this difficulty does not exist.

HISTORICAL.

Some sidelights on the history and personality of Berkeley the Idealist philosopher are thrown by Dr. Benjamin Rand, Ph.D., LL.D., of Harvard University, in his *Berkeley's American Sojourn* (Harvard University Press: \$2.00). From the tone of the book we would judge that the memory of Berkeley is held in greater reverence in America than it is in England; perhaps with reason, for Berkeley seems to have done much for Harvard and Yale, and indeed for American education generally, in the early years of their foundation and early struggles, two hundred years ago. We are here told in much detail the story of Berkeley's efforts to found a school in Bermuda and its failure, and of what became of the money that was gathered or granted for that purpose.

We reviewed the French "Manuel d'Histoire des Religions" called "Christus," a section of which is reproduced in *The Life of the Church* (Sheed & Ward: 7s. 6d.) and edited with valuable additions, by Father M. D'Arcy, S.J., as many as twenty years ago, but, as most of its contents refer to the past and express what are the traditional Catholic views of the growth and influence of the Church in the world, little change was needed to make it, in English, a vivid, fresh and arresting epitome of the working of the Leaven in the Meal. Church history in detail is generally so complicated, the reactions of the world so violent and so varied in space and time, that an *aperçu* such as this volume affords is a Godsend to the student. A group of French Jesuit historians have collaborated to describe the different chronological stages of the development of the Christian idea from the start to the present day, through the era of persecution, the lamentable alienation of the East, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, the Reform, Catholic and heretic, the Revolution and the growth of "post-Christianity." It is a stirring and suggestive picture, made more luminous by Father D'Arcy's brilliant introduction on Christ's living and working in the Church, and his penetrating summary of modern conditions at the end.

The Catholic Library of Religious Knowledge has recently added to its list a volume on *Polytheism and Fetishism*, by Rev. M. Briault, C.S.Sp., translated by Rev. P. Browne, D.Sc., of Maynooth (Sands: 3s. 6d.). The author first gives a brief account of the polytheism of Ur, Babylon, Egypt, Iran, India, China, Japan, Greece and Rome. In the second part, the author describes the fetishist religions, the worship of spirits and shades, the African primitive religion—so far as it can now be interpreted—and the sense of the moral law amongst savage tribes. The account of beliefs and practices of savage tribes given by Catholic missionaries is, of course, antecedently much more credible than any account written up by some ethnologist who has spent a few months on

an island in the Pacific, and much of what passes for modern research may be described as imaginative. People often ask the question: Have savages any idea of what we call the moral "law"? The author of the book under review, replies, "You may go the round of all tribes and races, and you will not find a population that is non-moral. Everywhere the difference between good and evil, between the permitted and the forbidden is notorious. . . . You will discover, ultimately, that the world is less far than you thought from our ancient Decalogue, that humanity, as a whole, everywhere, condemns robbery, violence, injustice, lying, impiety and even lust." Many people are also credulous in respect of the preternatural powers of sorcerers. Experienced missionaries declare that these powers do not exist. Trickery and fraud explain all the phenomena. Two facts make so-called sorcery possible, namely, the credulity of the native and the smartness of the sorcerer. Two factors account for barbarism, namely, superstition and terror. The odds are against the missionary, or rather, would be, but for the help of God.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

It is fitting that the biggest of English counties should have a corresponding opinion of itself and no one blames its natives overmuch for expressing that opinion, as Mr. G. C. Heseltine has done in his series of biographical sketches called *Great Yorkshiremen* (Longmans: 16s. n.). Herein are chronicled briefly, yet very readably, the careers of some dozen Yorkshire worthies whose only bond of union is the geographical one, for they are of various classes and epochs, as diverse as John Wycliffe and Blessed John Fisher, Guy Fawkes and Richard Rolle. Not all are historical characters but the accounts of local celebrities, like Blind Metcalf, and Henry Jenkins, who died at the age of one hundred and sixty-nine—"about," are not the least entertaining. These are "impressionist" sketches but of only one, that of Wycliffe, do we consider the impression misleading. To call him "a man of God" and to imply that the sole source of his revolt was clerical wickedness, and not, rather, thwarted ambition, is to write, shall we say? as a Yorkshireman instead of as an impartial historian.

Perhaps we expected too much when we took up Professor E. Allison Peers' Rede Lecture for 1932 on *St. John of the Cross* (Cambridge University Press: 2s. 6d.), but we have to confess that we were somewhat disappointed. No doubt the narrow space to which the author was confined, and the special audience he was to address, have hampered his freedom; nevertheless the lecture seems to us both uneven and incomplete. The subject is one of which Professor Allison Peers is master, especially on the historical and literary side; we do not, therefore, wonder that half the lecture is taken up with establishing the claim of St. John as a poet. In two further sections he discusses the saint as a teacher of asceticism and as a mystic; but in both of these we seem to recognize the interested humanist more than the disciple wholly in sympathy with the saint. There is much in this lecture that is of the greatest value, but we doubt whether, let us say, Mr. Montgomery Carmichael, would agree with the general impression that is produced. There are three short appendices to the lecture. It is difficult to see their purpose, unless it be to qualify some state-

ments made in the lecture itself. In one at least he misquotes a writer in order that he may demolish him; a proceeding we would never have expected in one usually so gracious.

We are glad to welcome *The Spirit of Margaret Sinclair* (Sands & Co.: 2s. 6d. n.), for more than the obvious reason of the intensely interesting essays it contains, contributed by various authors, among them Mrs. Armel O'Connor and Miss M. R. O'Rourke. The better-known this holy little Poor Clare becomes, the more will her Cause be thereby forwarded, and the more will the benefit of her intercessions be felt. The book is illustrated with photographs. Miss May Rita O'Rourke writes the second chapter, which one could wish was longer, but we would refer all interested in Margaret Sinclair to Miss O'Rourke's own delightful book on her, which is still on sale.

CATECHETICAL.

Many are saying that our "leakage" is due, not so much to the teaching of our schools but to the homes. If that is so, then *Le Décalogue de l'Autorité paternelle*, by R. P. Ch. de Maillardoz, S.J. (Bonne Presse, Paris), is a book in season. Under ten headings or commandments the author discusses the duty of parents to children, with a liveliness of illustration which gives life to his teaching, driving home his lessons by facts which must appeal to anyone with experience of children, their propensities and their questionings.

That astonishingly prolific yet accurate writer and teacher, Chanoine Eugène Duplessy, of Notre Dame de Paris, has added to the list of his doctrinal works, one entitled *Le Dogme Catholique* (Bonne Presse, Paris). It is the first part of an *Exposé de la Religion*, and the fourth volume of the author's *Cours supérieur*. In 560 closely printed pages it gives a complete course in French on the treatises of God, of Creation, of the Incarnation and Redemption, and of the Last Things. The work is intended primarily for Catholic readers, and is a model of conciseness and good order.

LITURGICAL.

The *Ceremoniale juxta Ritum Romanum* of P. Aloisio Maria de Carpo, O.M. (Marietti, Turin: 25.00 l.), with full index, has been revised and enlarged in its tenth edition, by P. Aloisio Moretti. This edition embodies all the latest decrees up to 1932, and is, therefore, a reliable guide in all matters connected with the Divine Office, chanted in Choir or recited privately, and the liturgy of the Mass. All rubrics are explained that regard private and solemn Masses, Conventual and Votive Masses, the Sacred Liturgy of Holy Week, the administration of Holy Communion, Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, Processions and the Forty Hours. A list of the decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites to which reference is made in the text, and of the Canons of the *Codex juris* quoted there, is given. The book is very full and will, we believe, solve all difficulties of priests and Masters of Ceremonies. The reviser is to be congratulated on so excellent a work.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The series "Les Pélerinages," as we have before noticed, aims at providing guide books to certain shrines, written rather as narrative

than in the ordinary matter-of-fact way. The latest, *Domremy*, by Charles Baussan (Flammarion: 10 fr.), is an excellent example of the kind. The author first visits the home of St. Joan, as it were, in her company, tells us what she did here and what there, then, when he has sent her away on her mission, he revisits the various places of interest in and round Domremy for closer inspection, talking to himself all the time, looking forward to the day when St. Joan would return in glory. It is a delicately written book, almost a prose poem, as it follows the spirit of the saint through her fields and woods.

LITERARY.

It is not a little thing that the Catholic Church in England has given to our literature much of the best of its poetry. We need not go back to the past; in the last half-century her record has been conspicuous enough, and even to-day she is not wanting. In *Francis Thompson et les Poètes Catholiques d'Angleterre* (Plon, Paris: 15 fr.) a well-read and sympathetic critic, Mlle. Agnès de la Gorce, chooses four for special study, Francis Thompson, Alice Meynell, Coventry Patmore, and Lionel Johnson. Her method is new and interesting. She approaches her poets, not as a critic, but as an interested friend and biographer. She tells their story, or rather she allows them to tell it for her, looking for it in the poems they have written. She has her mind filled with the lyrics of those who have gone before; Crashaw, Shelley, Tennyson, and many others are made to reflect the strains of her favourites, like echoes in the distance. Thus as we proceed she makes her writers live; and incidentally, while they live, the English Catholic is made to live with them, and to be interpreted by them. She seems anxious to show her French readers that with all their independence of thought, and perhaps of manner, English Catholics are just as true to their Faith as any other, and that their poets prove it. We have said that the author's background is biographical rather than critical; in reality Francis Thompson is her main subject, the others are introduced as crossing his path. When they come upon the scene, she pauses to consider them; but her heart is with her favourite all the time. She is full of understanding for the wanderer, full of sympathy for one who lived in this world like a bird with a broken wing; her analysis of the Hound of Heaven, much as that poem has been analysed before, has a character all its own. To her it is less a poem of repentance; it is more a song of consolation, a song of freedom, renewing the joy of which St. Augustine wrote when at last he was free. Of the other poets whom she has chosen to consider, perhaps we like best her estimate of Coventry Patmore. She sees at once his strength and his weakness; notices the change that came over the whole outlook when he became a Catholic; very picturesquely blends him with Francis Thompson when, as a Franciscan tertiary, he meets the latter at Pantasaph. It is unexpected touches such as this that make the author's study live, and prevent us from classing it merely as a piece of literary criticism.

The *Chronicle*, which is more than a mere school magazine since it ranges all over the world and from negro kindergartens to Oxford, is mainly concerned, as a chronicle, with the half-dozen schools conducted by the English Province of the Society of the Sacred Heart. It gives a fully illustrated account of those establishments and a record of their

year's doings. But it tells also of the world-wide activities of the Society and contains three stimulating essay-talks, by Rev. Fathers E. Leen, C.S.Sp., W. Roche, S.J., and C. C. Martindale, S.J., respectively, on the future before Catholic womanhood in these islands.

REPRINTS.

M. l'Abbé Charles Grimaud in editing the 30th edition of his book *Futures Espouses* (Téqui: 12.00 fr.), a work "crowned" by the French Academy, has introduced certain typographical improvements, and has given his treatment, which is at once detailed and thorough, a more universal character. Full use, too, has been made of that inspiring and authoritative Encyclical pronouncement—*Casti Connubii*.

One of the privileges attached to membership of the true Church, which no amount of good faith can secure for outsiders, is access through the gaining of Indulgences to the treasury of merits acquired by Christ and His Saints, and, perhaps, one of the keenest regrets which Catholics may have to experience hereafter will be caused by neglect to make use of that salutary privilege. A deeper appreciation of the doctrine and greater zeal in the practice will surely be the result of possessing Père J. Lacau's *Precieux Trésor des Indulgences* (Marii e Marietti: 15.00 fr.), which ministers at once to theology and devotion, and which now appears in a second up-to-date edition.

MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

We have before us four new C.T.S. pamphlets, price 2d., *The Order of the Good Shepherd*, by C. C. Martindale, S.J., tells, in a most interesting and lively manner, the history of that great Congregation and their Christ-like work, too little known, even among Catholics. *The Order of St. Ursula* gives us the life of St. Angela Merici in an edifying way. A reprint, revised and enlarged, of the timely paper—*Mr. Shaw's St. Joan*, published by Mr. Christopher Hollis in *The Dublin Review*, will supply a need, since that play is often misunderstood. *A Sign of Love*, by Mrs. B. R. Sutton, is a worthy addition to the Fiction series. A lecture on *The Eucharistic Congress, 1932*, written by Rev. M. Fitzsimons, O.M.I., to accompany an admirable set of over 50 slides is priced at 8d. In the smaller format, *In the Little Way of St. Teresa of Lisieux* contains extracts from the Saint's own writings; we cannot imagine that humble little saint "posing" of her own accord for her photograph as represented on the cover, which photograph, we are told, was taken by her sister. In view of Frederick Ozanam's Centenary next year—the well-known founder of the Society of S.V. de P.—a revised edition of his life, by B. F. C. Costelloe, has been issued. *Mother Mary of St. Euphrasia*, by Father Robert Eaton, is another amongst a large number of reprints.

The Catholic Mind (America Press, 5 cents), preserves many useful articles in its issues for July, August and September, notably, Father L. Watt's "Economic Dangers to the World Peace" and Mgr. MacMahon's address "The Catholic Woman in Modern Life."

The Rev. G. J. MacGillivray has written for the lower forms of Catholic Schools, *The Life of Our Lord* (B.O. & W.: 1s. 6d.), in clear and simple language which, we think, will be acceptable to others besides children.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

- BEAUCHESNE, Paris.
L'Eglise et la Rémission des Péchés aux Premiers Siècles. By Paul Galtier, S.J. Pp. xxii. 511. Price, 34.00 fr.
- BREPOLS' CATHOLIC PRESS, Turnhout.
"Benedictionale." By Rev. J. B. O'Connell. Pp. 88. Price, 6s.
- BRUCE PUBLISHING CO., New York.
The Mass-Liturgy. By Dom Fidelis Boeser, O.S.B. Pp. 141. Price, \$1.50.
- BURNS AND OATES, London.
A Daily Hymn Book, with music. Pp. 643. Price, 1s. 4d. *The Spirit of Margaret Sinclair.* By various authors. Illustrated. Pp. 127. Price, 2s. 6d. *Saint Vincent de Paul.* By Rev. Joseph Leonard, C.M. Pp. 287. Price, 6s. *The History and Liturgy of the Sacraments.* By Professor A. Villien. Pp. x. 374. Price, 8s. 6d. *On the Power of God.* By St. Thomas Aquinas. Pp. xii. 148. Price, 7s. 6d. *The Life of Our Lord for Catholic Schools.* By Rev. G. J. MacGillivray, M.A. Pp. x. 115. Price, 1s. 6d.
- C.T.S., London.
 Many New Pamphlets and Reprints, 2d. each.
- JOHNSON, Bognor.
Blissful Hours. By Rev. A. M. Kelly, O.S.M. Pp. 135. Price, 2s. 6d.
- HARDING AND MORE, London.
The Teaching Sisters of the Holy Cross. Illustrated. By a friend of the Order. Pp. 90. Price, 1s.
- HOLY CROSS PRESS, Mass.
Hortorum Libri IV. By René Rapin. Pp. xxxvi. 221.
- LONGMANS, London.
Faith Healing. By A. Clarke Begg, M.D. Pp. xi. 94. Price, 2s. 6d. n. *Sir Bertram Windle.* Illustrated. By Monica Taylor. Pp. xii. 428. Price, 12s. 6d. n.
- LOYOLA UNIVERSITY PRESS, Chicago.
The Light Divine in Parable and Allegory. 3rd impression. Il-
- lustrated. By Patrick J. O'Reilly, S.J. Pp. xiii. 320. Price, \$1.60.
- MARIETTI, Turin.
Ceremoniale juxta Ritum Romanum. By A. M. de Carpo, O.M. Tenth Edition. Pp. xviii. 816. Price, 25.00 l.
- METHUEN, London.
The Golden Sequence. By Evelyn Underhill. Pp. 193. Price, 5s. n.
- PEIGUES, Paris.
Mariage et Natalité. Pp. 336. Price, 30.00 fr.
- SANDS AND CO., London.
Talks for Girls. By Fr. A. Roche. Pp. 128. Price, 2s. n.
- SHEED AND WARD, London.
Broadcast Minds. By Ronald Knox. Pp. xv. 280. Price, 7s. 6d. n.
- SOCIETY OF THE DIVINE WORD,
 Techny, Ill.
Catholic Mission Theory. By Joseph Schmidlin, D.D. Pp. xi. 541. Price, \$5.00.
- S.P.C.K., London.
Anglican Orders: the Bull of Leo XIII. 2 vols, Latin and English. Pp. 59. 67. Price, 2s. 6d. each.
- TEQUI, Paris.
Sur les Pas d'Une Sainte. By Abbé V. Lepetit. Pp. xi. 108. *Les Enfants Sans Parents.* By Jean D'Avignon. Pp. 77. Price, 5.00 fr. *La Philosophie Chrétienne et la Pensée Contemporaine.* By Régis Jolivet. *Celle qui Ressuscita.* By René Gaell. Pp. viii. 241. Price, 9.00 fr. *Au Cœur de Jésus Agonisant.* By Mgr. J. Dargaud. Pp. xxxii. 167. Price, 8.00 fr. *La Vie de L'Au-Dela dans la Vision Beatifique.* By G. Joannes. Pp. 172. Price, 9.00 fr.
- THE AMERICA PRESS.
The Catholic Mind. Vol. XXX. Nos. 16. 17. 18.
- "VITA E PENSIERO," Milan.
Il Francescanesimo. By F. R. Agostino Gemelli, O.F.M. Pp. xvi. 465. Price, 20.00 l.

y,
o.

n.
h
e,

n
n.

e,

e.

x.

ph
i.

so
h.
.

3y
8.
3y
ce,
d-
m.
et.
né
ce,
sus
id.
fr.
la
es.

os.

R.
p.